

## THE INDUSTRIAL-ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGIST (TIP)

The *Industrial-Organizational Psychologist* is published three times yearly (April 1, August 1, and December 1) by the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology, American Psychological Association. The editorial office is located at the Graduate Division, Wright State University, Dayton, Ohio 45431. Published by the Hamilton Printing Co., Hamilton, Ohio. Inquiries regarding advertising should be directed to Dr. Saul Scherzer, General Electric, Bldg. 27EE, Boston Ave., Bridgeport, Connecticut 06602.

Address changes should be directed to APA Circulation Offices, 1200 Seventeenth St., N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036. Subscriptions are included with membership in the Division. TIP circulation is approximately 2,000 which includes the membership of the Division, leaders in the industrial and academic communities, APA officers and board members, presidents of APA divisions, Editors of APA newsletters, graduate students in industrial-organizational psychology, and to libraries and graduate schools.

Opinions expressed are those of the writers and do not necessarily reflect the official positions of the Division of Industrial-Organizational Psychology unless so stated.

### Table of Contents

Perloff Elected .....	2
Program Time Cut .....	2
Committee Nominations Sought .....	2
Focus on Don Grant .....	4
Message from the President .....	5
Notes and News .....	6
1974 Salary Survey .....	8
Toops .....	9
Report from APA Council .....	10
Professional Affairs Activities .....	11
Guidelines for Choosing Consultants .....	12
Public Relations Activities .....	14
Report from the Vail Conference .....	15
1974 Workshops .....	16
Workshop Registration Form .....	20
EEO Court Decisions .....	21
Membership Drive .....	26
FEP: An Editorial .....	27
Classified Ads .....	30
1973 Division Convention Program .....	31
Comments on Humanizing Organizational Psychology .....	32
The Giant Groves and The Field Advances .....	33
Herbert A. Toops Memorial Prize .....	37

**A.C. MacKinney** ..... Editor  
**M. J. Kavanagh**

Associate Editor

Advertising Manager

**Saul Scherzer**  
**General Electric**  
**Bldg. 27EE**  
**Bridgeport, Conn. 06602**

President, Div. 14

**Dr. E.A. Fleishman**  
**AIR**

**8555 Sixteenth St.**  
**Silver Spring, MD 20910**

Secretary-Treasurer, Div. 14

**Dr. Paul W. Thayer**  
**LIAMA**  
**170 Sigourney St.**  
**Hartford, Conn.**

New books from Prentice-Hall by educators focusing on

## ISSUES IN TODAY'S INDUSTRY

a complete teaching package...includes recent research trends in organization design, decision making, learning theory, and leadership...

"A full-scale text on organization development..."

### french • bell

**Organizational Development: Behavioral Science Interventions for Organization Improvement** by Wendell French and Cecil Bell, Jr., both of the University of Washington.

The French and Bell theory of organization development—what it is, where it came from, and where it is going. They illustrate and describe in detail most of the OD development in current use.

Comment on file states: "No other single book exists which is as detailed and thorough as this one. Specific assets include a set of excellent tables on data gathering and diagnosis..."  
1973, 224 pp., cloth \$9.95; paper \$5.95

A proven, successful text...now in a new 6th edition...

### mc cormick • tiffin

**Industrial Psychology, 6th Ed., 1974** by Ernest J. McCormick and Joseph Tiffin, both of Purdue University.

Applies psychological insight and methods to problems of industry. Updated to include recent changes in the developing field of organizational psychology. Views new leadership and management styles as related to employee behavior and performance, and reviews government regulations in tests for minority groups. Covers (PAQ) Position Analysis Questionnaire, and more. Discusses practical "worker problems". Illustrated by 200 figures and tables. Project method **Workbook** available.  
January 1974, 624 pp., cloth \$12.50

### kolb • rubin • mc intyre

**Organizational Psychology: An Experiential Approach, 2nd Ed., 1974** by David A. Kolb and Irwin M. Rubin, both of M. I. T., and James M. McIntyre, Development Research Associates, Inc.

Fifteen self-contained units, each with one key concept central to the understanding of human behavior in social and organizational situations. Each unit gives student three or four learning objectives; introduces key concept with relevant theory; offers experiential simulation (exercise, game, etc.) to involve student; and provides a summary.

Includes NEW self-diagnostic learning questionnaire at each unit end; NEW yellow pages of learning (indexed compilation of new learning experience) for student to try alone or in small groups, or for instructor to use as supplement. **NEW Teacher's Manual** available. February 1974, 480 pp., paper \$7.95

**Organizational Psychology: A Book of Readings, 2nd Ed., 1974** also by Kolb, Rubin, and McIntyre.

Readings—many new, specifically prepared for new edition, relates more closely to workbook and covers latest work in the field. Spring 1974, 464 pp., paper \$6.95

For further information, write: Robert Jordan, Dept. J-908

**prentice-hall**

Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey 07632

## Perloff Elected Treasurer of APA

**Robert Perloff** has been elected Treasurer of APA in a special election, succeeding Division 14 member **Bill McGehee** of Fieldcrest Mills. Dr. Perloff is Professor of Business Administration and Psychology, University of Pittsburgh. In addition to his position as Treasurer, Dr. Perloff will be serving a four-year term as a member of the Board of Directors. Dr. Perloff is presently completing a term of office as one of Division 14's representatives to APA Council.

## 1974 Program Time Cut

The Chairman of the division's Program Committee for 1974, **Jack Bartlett** of the University of Maryland, reports that the division's program time has been cut from 35 to 31 hours for the 1974 annual meeting in New Orleans. The committee requested more program time to better accommodate the time demands of an increasing member participation, but the request was denied by APA. The program provides for two invited addresses, business meetings, a presidential address, executive committee meetings, social hours, and, of course, the typical paper, symposium, and conversation - discussion hour periods.

Chairman Bartlett also reports that the committee is beginning its deliberative work and will meet later in the spring to determine the final program. Suggestions, comments, or inquiries concerning the program should be addressed to Dr. Bartlett at the Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park.

## Committee On Committees Seeks Nominations

**Gene Mayfield** reminds you again that he would like to receive the names of individuals who would be interested in serving on the standing committees (Program, Education and Training, Fellowship, Membership, Professional Affairs, Workshop, Public Relations, Public Policy and Social Issues, and Scientific Affairs) for the year 1974-75. If you know of someone who is well qualified, or are interested yourself, please let Gene know.

Your letter should include enough information about the individual so that the members of the Committee on Committees can make meaningful judgments. This might include information about the nominee's current activities, past committee activities inside and outside Division 14, names of others who are acquainted professionally with the nominee, etc. The letter should also indicate if there is a preference for a particular standing committee.

Gene's address is:

Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association  
170 Sigourney Street  
Hartford, Connecticut 06105

tpc

### Announces...

THE BASS-VALENZI MANAGEMENT STYLES PROFILE -- a survey feedback procedure

#### PURPOSES

- .... To increase awareness of the manager's system of his subordinates and himself.
- .... To highlight discrepancies between a manager and his subordinates.
- .... To diagnose factors affecting satisfaction and effectiveness.
- .... To diagnose appropriateness of a manager's management style.
- .... To provide an organizational survey using an open systems model.

#### METHODS

Computerized displays of each manager's profile  
Matched anonymous subordinate analyses  
31 factored scales  
Integrated systems model

#### APPLICATIONS

O.D. Workshops  
Management development programs  
Individual counseling  
Measurement of change efforts

INPUTS →	WITHIN-SYSTEM RELATIONS →	MANAGERIAL STYLES →	OUTPUTS
Organizational	Power	Directive	Effectiveness
Work Group	Information	Negotiative	Satisfactions
Task	Structure	Consultative	
Personal	Objectives	Participative	
		Delegative	

PRICE: \$30 PER MANAGER PROFILE

INQUIRIES ARE INVITED FROM AGENCIES, BUSINESS FIRMS AND CONSULTANTS

TRANSNATIONAL PROGRAMS CORPORATION, 54 MAIN STREET, SCOTTSVILLE, N.Y. 14546 716/889-1180

Sample PROFILE kit containing manager and subordinate questionnaires, counselor's guide and computer print-out of a manager's PROFILE..... \$1.00 ea. Quantity

#### OTHER SELF-GUIDED TPC PROGRAMS

PROSPECTS (For career counseling).....\$10.00 ea. —  
PAXIT (Effectiveness of five managerial styles).....\$10.00 ea. —  
PROFAIR (Effective utilization of women personnel).....\$10.00 ea. —  
PROSPER (Effective utilization of black personnel).....\$10.00 ea. —  
PROCESS (Eight integrated quasi-T group sessions).....\$20.00 ea. —  
Administrator's Manual for PROCESS.....\$25.00 ea. —

Mail to:

Bill to: (if different)

## FOCUS ON DON GRANT

Don Grant, Personnel Manager-Research for A T & T was elected President-elect of the division last year and will assume the Presidency this coming fall. Don has been with A T & T since 1956, responsible primarily for personnel research administration in the areas of selection and development of management personnel. Prior to joining A T & T he was with The Prudential Insurance Co. and Case Western Reserve University. Before attending graduate school at Ohio State (PhD in 1952) Don worked for Sharp & Dohme, Philadelphia. He served in both the European and Pacific theatres as an artillery officer in World War II. He has served in many professional capacities: Secretary-Treasurer of the division, 1969-72; Fellow of the AAAS; Diplomate of ABPP since 1959 and a member of the Board of Trustees since 1969; Editor, *Validity Information Exchange*, **Personnel Psychology**, 1953-59, and member of the editorial board since 1959; A T & T representative to the Executive Study Conference, 1958-70, and Chairman of the conference, 1965-67. He has published many professional and technical papers in a variety of outlets, including a book which is about to be released by Wiley entitled "Formative Years in Business" with **Doug Bray** and **Dick Campbell**, which is one of a series of forthcoming books on the A T & T management progress study.

**TIP** inquired of Don how he happened to get into Industrial - Organizational Psychology, and here is his answer. "You will note that I did not major in psychology as an undergraduate. Upon graduating from Princeton I accepted a position as a management trainee with Sharp and Dohme (now a part of Merck) in



Dr. Grant

Philadelphia. Shortly after Pearl Harbor I was taken out of training and assigned to the Personnel Department. A couple of months later I beat the draft board by volunteering for service in the Army. Upon my return in 1946 I rejoined Sharp and Dohme and was assigned the position of Employment Manager for the entire company. A few months later I was promoted to the position of Chief Job Analyst and was given responsibility for administering wage matters for the entire company. During this period I became acquainted with several psychologists and began taking graduate work in the evening at Temple University. The combined work experience and course work convinced me that I should take graduate work full time and direct my efforts to the PhD degree. I cite this history because I am convinced it has oriented me to the practical application of psychology in problems of utilizing human resources in industry and other organizations. I tried one

(Continued on Page 34)

During the preceding months your Executive Committee has been very active in pursuing the goals I described in the last issue of **TIP**. The minutes of the Executive Committee meeting held January 20-21 in Washington, portions of which are summarized elsewhere in this issue, perhaps best summarize these activities.

A major effort involved getting our inputs into the Equal Opportunity Coordinating Council responsible for drafting the revision of the EEOC guidelines. We were instrumental in getting the open hearing arranged and in getting written comments to the Council. **Wayne Sorenson**, Chairman of the Professional Affairs Committee, played a major role in coordinating these efforts.

Below is a letter which I sent to the Council, after holding a meeting of several members of the Executive and Professional Affairs Committees in early December. Following this is a reply received from **Bill Gorham**, one of the Civil Service Commission representatives to the staff group of the Equal Employment Opportunity Council. This is as close to an official reply as we are likely to get and pretty much summarizes the status of the situation with regard to the Guidelines.

December 14, 1973

Mr. David Rose, Chief  
Employee Section  
Civil Rights Division  
U. S. Department of Justice  
Washington, D. C. 20530

Dear Mr. Rose:

The Executive Committee of the Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology wishes to offer its assistance and its comments

regarding the proposed new guidelines on employment selection procedures. We wish to offer the services of Division 14 as a resource to you while underscoring the considerable concern on the part of the membership about the present draft form of the guidelines.

Division 14 of the American Psychological Association is made up of approximately 1,300 psychologists specializing in the research areas associated with governmental, university, business and other organizations. The activities of the members encompass a wide variety of practical and theoretical concerns. One of the most prominent and traditional areas, in terms of research effort, is that of improving employee selection decisions. It is probable that the great majority of psychologists having an interest in this area belong to Division 14; thus, it seems appropriate for Division 14 to render an official comment on the guidelines.

The comments made in this letter are judged to reflect the majority views of the Division membership. This judgment is based on careful review of the comments made in writing by Division members directly to our Committee on Professional Affairs, an analysis and review of all the written comments submitted directly to the Coordinating Council, as well as of those presented in oral form at the public meeting on the guidelines, held on November 15, 1973. Our Executive Committee and Professional Affairs Committee met on December 10 to review these materials and to formulate our position.

First, it goes without saying that we share the aims and objectives of equal employment opportunity. We see it as the purpose of the guidelines to provide the public with assurance

(Continued on Page 38)



## NOTES AND NEWS

by Art MacKinney

**TIP** has just been informed of the death of **Edward J. Sweeney**, Senior Scientist, Life Insurance Marketing and Research Association (formerly LIAMA) of Hartford, Connecticut. Dr. Sweeney was 49 years old. Paul Thayer, long-time associate of Dr. Sweeney and Executive Vice-President of LIMRA, describes him as "... a very good scientist and a helluva nice guy."

**Mary L. Tenopyr**, American Telephone and Telegraph, has been elected to the Board of Professional Affairs by the Council of Representatives, APA. Dr. Tenopyr is presently a member of the division's Executive Committee and was formerly chief of research programs with the Civil Service Commission.

The School of Management, SUNY Binghamton, announces that it has acquired the International Research Group of Management data base. The data base includes over 100,000 observations of managerial attitudes, demographics, and behaviors across 50 countries. It is growing by approximately 25% annually. The operations are directed by **Bernard Bass**, University of Rochester, **Robert Doktor** and **Philip Burger** of SUNY Binghamton. Inquiries should be sent to any of the three persons named.

**Wayne Sorenson**, Assistant Vice-President for Research, State Farm Insurance, has been appointed to the APA Insurance Trust. Dr. Sorenson is also chairman of the division's Professional Affairs Committee.

**Charles Bahn** has been appointed Associate Dean of Faculty for Special Programs at John Jay College of Criminal Justice. Dr. Bahn was first appointed at John Jay as Associate Professor of Psychology in 1967 and has subsequently held posts as Professor of Psychology and Director of Special Programs. Formerly he was with CCNY and Columbia University.

**Walter L. Ross** has been appointed Vice-President and Director of Management Services, Behavior Science Corporation of Los Angeles and Washington, D.C. The Washington office is under the direction of **Lance Seberhagen**. BASICO's address is 1100 Glendon Ave., Los Angeles, or 7600 Old Springhouse Rd., McLean, VA.

ABPP is now accepting applications for candidacy for its diploma in I-O Psychology. Write **Mark Lewin**, 185 Broad St., Rochester, NY 14604. And see the full notice elsewhere in this issue of **TIP**.

The 73-74 officers of the Metropolitan New York Association for Applied Psychology (METRO) are **Virginia Schein**, President, **George Hollenbeck**, Vice-President, **Robert Dugan**, Secretary, and **Patricia Dyer**, Treasurer. METRO meets monthly to discuss topics of interest to members. This year's speakers include **Daniel Yankelovich**, **Ed Lawler**, **Mel Sorcher**, **Frank Friedlander**, and **Herb Shepard**. For further information write Dr. Schein at Metropolitan Life Insurance Co., One Madison Ave., New York, NY 10010 or telephone her at 212-578-3405.

The Division 14 Workshop Committee is considering the possibility of homegrown entertainment for the workshop cocktail party in the form of a **Dixieland Band**. If you play an instrument and can adapt to New Orleans dixieland write **Robert Dugan**, ITT, 320 Park Ave., New York, NY 10022. The party will follow the all-day workshops on August 29, Marriott Hotel, New Orleans.

The Institute for Administrative Research, Inc., is a private non-profit research foundation affiliated with the Academy of Management. Its purpose is to sponsor and encourage research in the field of management and to disseminate the findings of management research. The Institute is dependent for support on gifts, grants, and membership allocations from companies and

other organizations. Participation and support of those interested in management research is welcomed. Write Dept. W, 20th Floor, 135 West 50th St., New York, NY 10020.

**Samuel S. Dubin**, Pennsylvania State University, was awarded a Visiting Lectureship by the Division of Scientific Affairs, NATO. In October, 1973, he visited twelve universities in eight European countries speaking on the topic, "The Psychology of Keeping Up-to-date".

The Society of Engineering Psychologists, Division 21 of APA, is seeking interested Division 14ers for its membership. Division 21 is concerned with the development and application of psychological principles and data to the design, operation, and evaluation of living and work environments, consumer products, equipment and systems. If you are interested in membership write the Chairman of the Membership Committee, **Harold P. Van Cott**, 8300 Still Spring Court, Bethesda, MD, 20034.

**Patricia C. Smith**, Professor of Psychology at Bowling Green (Ohio) State University, has been appointed liaison between Division 14 and the Committee on Specialty Practice of the Board of Professional Affairs, APA. As soon as **TIP** finds out what this means, you will be the first to know. In the meantime, remember you saw it first in **TIP**.

**Warren Blumenfeld**, **Phil Ash**, and **Mary Tenopyr**, among others, are authors of a forthcoming book entitled "Selection in the Public Sector" to be published by the International Personnel Management Association.

**Ralph J. Strauss**, formerly a consultant to the Maritime Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, has been appointed Manager, Human Performance Systems, First National City Bank. Dr. Strauss' address is 399 Park Ave., NY, NY 10022.

Invited participants at the Air Force Office of Scientific Research Planning Conference for Research in Human Resources for 1980-85 included Division 14 members **Milt Hakel**, Ohio State University, **Ernest McCormick**, Purdue University, **Bob Perloff**, University of Pittsburgh, and **Lyman Porter**, University of California, Irvine. The conference was held December 10-14, 1973.

News from **Harry Levinson**, The Levinson Institute, Cambridge, Mass.: The recent book, **The Great Jackass Fallacy**, is going into its third printing; the institute is now running eight seminars per year on psychological aspects of leadership; Dr. Levinson is participating in a WHO meeting in Stockholm this summer on occupational stress; a new newsletter, **The Levinson Letter**, has just been launched. Address: Box 95, Cambridge, 02138; telephone: 617-547-8687.

**Samuel S. Dubin** directed a conference for the Engineering Foundation of New York City on the topic of Maintaining Professional and Technical Competence of the Older Engineer — Engineering and Psychological Aspects. The conference, held in Maine, had a number of Psychologists participating in the program: **Paul Thompson** and **Richard Kopelman**, Harvard Business School; **Frank Landy** and **Gerald Susman**, The Pennsylvania State University; **Irene Hulicka**, State University at Buffalo; **H. G. Kaufman**, Brooklyn Polytechnic Institute; **Ben Scheider** and **Irwin Goldstein**, University of Maryland; **Walter Storey**, General Electric Company; **James Fozard**, Veterans Administration, Boston; **Lewis Davis**, University of California at Los Angeles. The proceedings will be published early in 1974 as a monograph in **The Continuing Engineering Studies Series of the American Society of Engineering Education**.

**Jack Parrish** has been appointed Coordinator, Human Resource Systems, GM Corporation, Detroit. In addition, Jack will be teaching organizational

behavior for the School of Economics and Management, Oakland University.

**Ivan Ross**, Membership Chairman for Division 23, Consumer Psychology, has asked **TIP** to extend an invitation to Division 14 members to consider membership in Division 23. Traditionally an interdisciplinary specialty, the practice, teaching, and research in Consumer Psychology has drawn from industrial, social, experimental, and clinical psychology. The consumer psychologist calls on the theories and methods of psychology as the means for studying and understanding the consumer. Write: Ivan Ross, Department of Marketing, College of Business, University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, 55455.

The E & T sub-committee on Social Issues (**Ann Hussein**, Chairperson, **John Hinrichs** and **Shel Zedeck**) is preparing some bibliographies for use in teaching (others and self). They need inputs — whether complete lists or a single, good reference on any and all topics relevant to social issues in I-O Psychology. If there are many publications, as in areas of minority employment, selection procedures, and union activities, please send the committee information on recent, outstanding works and good starting-point references that you know of. For less well-known topics, such as correctional institutions and convicts, conflict of interest, I-O mental health, please send a more comprehensive list, if you can. Everything will be appreciated. They will announce and/or publish in **TIP** the compiled bibliographies. Contact: Ann Hussein, GTE Labs, 40 Sylvan Road, Waltham, Mass. 02154. Telephone: 617-890-8460.

The Professional Education Subcommittee of the Division's Education and Training Committee (**Al Bass**, **Doug Bray**, **George Thornton**, and **Sheldon Zedeck**) is preparing a bibliography pertaining to the issues in professional education. They have asked that any member having bibliographies, papers, etc., pertaining to professional education issues send them to: Dr. Sheldon Zedeck, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley, 94720.

**Stanley Seashore**, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan, participated in the forty-third American Assembly, Columbia University, November 1-4, 1973. The American Assembly holds meetings and publishes authoritative books to illuminate issues of U.S. policy. The forty-third assembly reported on "The Changing World of Work".

## 1974 Salaries To Be Surveyed

The division's Executive Committee has determined that a salary survey of the membership will be conducted in 1974. The survey will be carried out by the Professional Affairs Committee, **Wayne Sorenson**, Chairman. The last survey was made in 1971, and with the rapid change in salary levels since that time, the data are badly out-of-date. It is expected that the questionnaires will be placed in the mail in the near future and that data will be available for publication in **TIP** before the end of the year.

It is now division policy that salary surveys will be carried out every three years and results will be made widely available through publication. Many comments received by both the Executive Committee and the Professional Affairs Committee have attested to the usefulness of these data in helping establish salary policy in both business and academic organizations.

## TOOPS

by Robert Perloff

Toops. If it can be said of each of us that no two people are alike, then it is unarguable that there is no one, but no one, whose profile — oh how Toops was hooked on profiles, an incurable gourmet of profiles was he — looks like his. Toops the man whose love of the mind and addiction — for that's what it was, nothing less than an addiction — to ideas was surely as strong on the day he died as it was as a doctoral student of **E. L. Thorndike**, amid those halcyon days at Teachers College, Columbia University, during the first quintile (he doted on quintiles, quartiles, and deciles) of the 20th century.

Toops the renaissance man. Toops the lovable tightwad whose adulation of vintage automobiles — as a monetary pragmatist, never as a prodigal hobbyist! — and habituation to Spartan living make Jack Benny come across as a confirmed spendthrift. Toops the professor, the architect of omnibus tests for which every scrap, every smidgen, every discarded bit of human information chanced upon — anywhere, at auction sales, junkyards, faculty receptions, and even in the classroom — was nurtured with tender loving care as a possible test item (his knowledge of and affection for test items is rivaled — but not exceeded — by the moon scientist's devotion to moon rocks and moon dust).

Toops the psychologist with competence in, unbridled enthusiasm for, and limitless hypotheses about counseling and guidance, human motivation, psychometrics, statistics, student personnel, and a string of et ceteras projecting the archetypically undisciplined generalist into the demeaning mold of a myopic specialist. Toops was 76 when he died on August 12, 1972.

His incredible breadth and his tireless alertness to the implications

of psychological principles and tools for all manner of problems pedestrian and profound, will remain forever, for those of us who knew him and for the larger number of less fortunate others who knew only of him, among the stingy sprinkling of beloved memories which neither time nor the senseless press of daily commitments can ever erase.

Consider his more conventional contributions, those explicitly psychological in nature. His variety of correlational formulas, techniques, charts, and computational aids. His monumental and now classic **Ohio State University Psychological Examination**. His mechanical and the other tests he developed or had a strong hand in producing. How about his seminal concept of ulstriths and addends, wedding extraordinarily rare psychological insights with his unfailing reliance upon quantitative psychology? And speaking of "seminal" and "wedding", surviving Herbert Anderson Toops are his wife, Laura, three sons, two daughters, twelve grandchildren, and a "standard million" (for compiling norms).

Then there is the set of extracurricular uses to which he directed his genius. He has bequeathed, for example, a legion of anecdotes and essays about retirement, auctions, gardening, life on the farm (especially what adolescents did behind closed barn doors), dishwashing, divining, house renovation, and how a young indigent student (Toops himself) "ripped off" a New York restaurateur circa World War I.

The score (another word he adored, though in a different sense, and on which he wrote and lectured at some length) of students for whom he served as major professor includes **Dorothy Adkins**, **Harold Edgerton**, **Dick Gaylord**, **Fritz Kuder**, **Al Kurtz**, **Bill Layton**, **Bill Schrader**, and **Bob Wherry**. This list of doctoral products

(Continued on Page 37)

## Report on Council of Representatives Meeting Washington, D.C., January 18-20, 1974

by Lyman W. Porter

The winter meeting of the APA Council of Representatives is the Council's major annual meeting. (A shorter meeting of Council is also held each year in connection with the Annual Convention). Attending Council this year were Division 14's four Representatives: **Bob Perloff, Vic Vroom, Ed Lawler, and Lyman Porter.**

The emotional and substantive highlight of the meeting occurred in connection with the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on APA-CAPPS Relationships. The Committee recommended, and this was approved by the Board of Directors and subsequently by Council action, that APA **not** accept CAPPS as an advocacy organization which will meet appropriately the needs of all psychologists. The Committee further recommended, and this was also approved by the Board of Directors and Council, that a legally independent advocacy organization be created by APA (through the action of Council). Immediately following Council's approval of this recommendation, the Chairman of the Policy and Planning Board submitted a proposed set of guidelines for such an organization. These were approved by Council, and hence we now have a new organization sponsored by APA and known as the Association of American Psychologists (AAP). It will have a 15-person Board of Trustees to be composed initially of APA members appointed by the Board of Directors. (Subsequently they will be elected by members of AAP). This organization will be composed of voluntary members (both individuals and organizations) with the stated purpose of advocating positions on issues of concern to psychologists. APA was authorized to loan funds for initial expenses, but it was made clear that such an organization was expected to become

entirely self-sufficient through dues from members that choose to join the organization.

Following the above action of Council creating such an organization, CAPPS asked that APA issue a statement in support of CAPPS activity with respect to their suit against the Blues. Council voted (unanimously) the sense of such a motion, but left the exact wording up to the Board of Directors so that the language would legally protect APA.

In other action, Council:

(1) Voted to establish an ad hoc committee to study the issue of Divisional autonomy and, particularly, whether Divisions should be separately incorporated. The most pressing question is how Division actions might or might not affect APA's 501, c-3 tax status. Specifically, the ad hoc committee will consider whether Divisions: (a) can commit funds not currently available, (b) should account to APA for their income and expenditures; and (c) may institute legal actions without prior approval of the Board of Directors.

(2) Voted approval for the Association to obtain liability insurance for all known Division publications.

(3) Received the report of the Ad Hoc Committee on APA Reorganization and recommended further study of various reorganization plans by the Policy and Planning Board. (In effect, there will be no immediate reorganization of any type.)

(4) Voted to have Las Vegas considered as a possible future site for an Annual Meeting.

(5) Approved a Budget of \$6,120,000 with a projected surplus of \$44,000. Also related: received a report from the Treasurer that a dues increase was likely for 1975; and voted a goal of establishing a liquid reserve of \$1,000,000 by 1978.

## Activities of the Professional Affairs Committee

by Wayne Sorenson

Activities associated with the draft of the "Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures" have preoccupied the attention of the Professional Affairs Committee since September of 1973.

We became aware of the existence of the draft of new guidelines affecting employment decisions during the APA Convention in Montreal. The majority of industrial and organizational psychologists were not cognizant of the proposed new guidelines, although drafts of them had been distributed on an informal basis to a number of individuals, including some Division 14 members. The task of learning more about the guidelines and assisting the Division 14 Executive Committee in reacting to them, was assigned to the Professional Affairs Committee.

The first activity undertaken vis-a-vis the draft guidelines was to schedule a special meeting between Division 14 membership and the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council on October 23, 1973. This meeting was scheduled but was canceled and superseded by a meeting occurring on November 15, to which all psychologists interested in testing and employment issues including, but not limited to Division 14 membership, were invited. The November 15 meeting did take place and was co-chaired by **Kenneth Little**, Executive officer of APA and **David L. Rose**, Chairman, Staff Committee, Equal Employment Coordinating Council. The panel, representing the five segments of the Federal Government, coordinated efforts to draft the new guidelines, listened to and questioned speakers, but under the rules of the meeting, did not accept questions directed to the panel. The five government agencies coordinating on the draft are:

Equal Employment Opportunity Commission (EEOC)  
Office of Federal Contract Compliance (OFCC)  
U.S. Civil Service Commission  
U.S. Commission on Civil Rights  
The Justice Department

Based on the attendance and the degree of active participation, the meeting was a considerable success. It was attended by more than 140 psychologists and other interested parties who made many worthwhile comments. The January APA **Monitor** describes the meeting in detail. In addition to the oral remarks made at the public meeting, many individuals have submitted written comments directly to the Coordinating Council.

Copies of most of the written comments and also of the oral comments have been obtained by the Professional Affairs Committee. These have been content analyzed, and recommendations submitted to the Executive Committee were based on this analysis.

Several recommendations were formulated and submitted to the Executive Committee based on the content analysis of written and oral comments. The recommendations were considered by a special meeting of the Executive Committee on December 10 in Washington, D.C., at which time a letter was drafted to the Chairman of the Coordinating Council which represents the position of the Division 14 Executive Committee vis-a-vis the guidelines.

A letter was written by the Professional Affairs Committee Chairman to David Rose requesting that he keep Division 14 informed of future activities in this area.

It is probable that there will be continuing activities associated with the development of the new guidelines. We will continue efforts to have the EEO



Coordinating Council view Division 14 as a valuable resource in further developments of the guidelines.

In other business, the Professional Affairs Committee was charged with the task of developing guidelines for choosing consultants for selection validation research and implementation. These guidelines were available at the time of the September Executive Committee Meeting; however, there was not an opportunity to review and discuss them. It was suggested that they be published in *TIP* and a response be obtained from the membership; but, because of the EEO-related activities, this was not accomplished. Therefore, the guidelines were submitted for consideration by the Executive Committee at the January, 1974, meeting.

## **Guidelines for Choosing Consultants for Psychological Selection Validation Research and Implementation**

**Prepared by The Professional Affairs Committee**

The proper use of procedures in selection and placement of people in organizations is not only desirable, but in most instances, it is required by law. It is necessary that any selection device (tests, interviews, application forms, etc.) be used in a manner that does not select unfairly among individuals. In order to satisfy legal requirements in most situations, the selection tests or other procedures must be properly "validated." "Validation" is the term commonly employed to describe the determination of the value of personnel selection procedures.

Validation of psychological tests and other selection tools requires a high degree of specialized competency and experience which is not always available within organizations, particularly smaller ones. Nevertheless, it is necessary that all organizations meet the requirements of various state and federal laws and it is often necessary to seek the professional services of persons or firms qualified to validate selection procedures.

The Industrial and Organizational Division (Division 14) of the American Psychological Association (APA) has prepared the following guidelines to assist organizations in the determination of qualified individuals or firms seeking professional help in selection validation procedures. There is not a single standard upon which a judgment about qualification for selection validation can be made (e.g., special validation license, list of recommended or acceptable persons, etc.). Therefore, the standards are termed guidelines in recognition of the fact that the burden for deciding upon candidates for validation work rests within the organization seeking such services.

Some judgment must be exercised by the person or firm having to select a qualified selection-validation consultant and, to some degree, the problem is no different than that of selecting a consultant of any kind. Most consultants (individuals or firms) with sufficient competence and experience to perform psychological test validation would fulfill the requirements of the guidelines.

### **(1) Certification**

Most states require that persons who offer psychological services to the public, including test validation, must be certified or licensed. Requirements vary state by state, but such certification or licensing should be considered as a minimum requirement. Proof of certification or licensing may be demanded because official documents are provided to persons having passed the examination and other requirements for state certification or licensing.

### **(2) Professional Membership**

Generally, persons engaged in test validation work belong to the American Psychological Association (APA). Membership is probable in Division 14 of the American Psychological Association (Division of Industrial and Organizational Psychology) or Division 5 (Division of Evaluation and Measurement). Although membership in either the APA or Divisions 14 or 5 is not crucial, it indicates that the person subscribes to the principles and ethics of this professional organization. Thus, membership in the APA is strongly recommended.

A very desirable additional qualification is the possession of diplomate status from the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP) with a speciality in industrial and organizational psychology.

### **(3) Education**

Most industrial and organizational psychologists hold the Ph.D. degree. Some competent persons do not, but in these cases, the experience of the person should be explored very carefully. A Bachelor's Degree is not sufficient. Regardless of degree, the individual's training should have included heavy emphasis on statistics and behavioral sciences.

### **(4) Knowledge and Experience**

A potential consultant should be able to provide evidence of similar work and experience in business, industry, government, etc. in the area of test validation including, if possible, reprints or reports of his researches. In the case of test validation, a minimum requirement should be that the consultant demonstrate familiarity with existing federal and state laws and regulations that are applicable (e.g., Uniform Guidelines on Employee Selection Procedures, etc.). Similarly, the potential candidate should be familiar with the Standards for Educational and Psychological Tests and Manuals published by the APA.

In cases where individuals may not have had the time to build a repository of experience, then evidence of specific graduate training in test and measurement theory, statistics, and behavioral science should be sought (preferably from a transcript from an accredited college or university).

### **(5) Recent Clients**

The names of previous clients should be provided in order that they may be verified. Questions about the consultant's specific tasks performed, integrity, promptness, and fulfillment of obligations could be answered in this manner.

### **(6) Claims Made**

Normally, a competent professional will **not** make any claims for extraordinary results nor guarantee certain positive outcomes. Such claims, if made, should be grounds for discontinuing further consideration of the potential consultant. Exaggerated claims, whether made verbally or in a brochure, are unethical and would not be made by acceptable consultants. Further, the potential consultant should not be interested in selling or promoting a unique method or device that only he can perform. Acceptable procedures are available to all qualified professionals.

### **(7) Fees**

No generally agreed upon standard fee or fee rate is established. The nature of the task and experience of the person(s) will figure in determining the fee to be charged. The firm seeking the services of the consultant should negotiate a fee satisfactory to each party. However, the fee should be for services performed and, in no case, should be dependent upon provisions of some "positive" or "guaranteed" results.

## The Activities Of The Public Relations Committee

by Olga E. Engelhardt

The Speakers' Directory is being readied for publication and will display the new cover design developed by **Jack Butler** in collaboration with **Sandra Bohnet**, staff artist at Ernst and Ernst. The Directory, prepared by Olga Engelhardt and Jack Butler, consists of:

A disclaimer; An alphabetical listing of speakers and their topics; A speaker and topic index; A sample of an evaluation form to be reproduced and used by organizations who invite I/O speakers to address their groups. The evaluation form is prefaced by a reminder that users of the I/O Directory are expected to analyze their own data and report back to the Public Relations Committee the overall effectiveness of the speaker.; A listing, by name only, of more than 1200 Division 14 I/O psychologists. (Approximately 17% of the membership is available for speaker engagements. Many of the organizations receiving the Directory may not be familiar with Division 14 of the APA and it is expedient to show some evidence of the size of the membership.)

The first printing of 3000 copies will be mailed to the Division 14 membership and to 1500 selected organizations, associations and chambers of commerce. The mailing list was developed by **Al Fredian** and represents a carefully culled selection of organizations most likely to seek our expertise.

The publication of the Directory will occur simultaneously with spot radio and periodical advertisements. One advertisement was developed last year by Olga E. Engelhardt and is being held in readiness. Other ads are in the process of being developed by **M. Scott Myers**, **Herbert Krugman**, and **Sol Scherzer**.

One of the goals of the committee this year is to explore ways of in-

forming the public about the I/O specialization. **Bob Peterson** has prepared a partial listing of potential markets for the publication of popular articles by I/O psychologists. The list includes publications such as **Society**, **Human Behavior**, **Management Digest**, etc. The complete list will appear in the Summer issue of **TIP**.

As a way of exploring other means of informing the public of I/O expertise, **Al Fredian** and **Mark Silber** prepared a radio script extolling the virtues of I/O psychology. The 30 second spot ad was pilot tested in February by Al Fredian over a local Chicago station and by Olga Engelhardt, over station WONC in Naperville, Illinois. A revised version of the script will be cassette recorded for future use. The script will be published as well in Summer **TIP**. A second spot ad is being developed and progress is being made on ways of evaluating the effectiveness of the ad.

A campaign to inform women, minority group members and undergraduate psychology majors of career opportunities in I/O psychology is another goal of the committee. It will be expected that all members of Division 14 who travel or work near small undergraduate schools, where I/O psychology is not available in the psychology curriculum, will make arrangements for addressing student groups about the nature and scope of I/O psychology. Emphasis will be on career potentials and graduate school training. As a way of facilitating this development the committee plans to determine via questionnaire which schools in the country offering an undergraduate major in psychology also offer courses in I/O. Once developed, such a list should be invaluable to the Division. It should enable

(Continued on Page 36)

## Report To Executive Committee On Vail Recommendations

by Robert M. Guion

Division 14's immediate Past - President **Bob Guion** was one of the attendee - participants at last summer's Vail Conference on professional training in psychology. His summary of the recommendations of the conference plus his view of "implications for Division 14" were presented to the Executive Committee in January. They are reproduced below. (A.C.M.)

### Summary of Recommendations

1. The locus of professional training may be in any of a variety of settings, but the content must be "rooted ideologically and theoretically in comprehensive psychological science."

2. Training programs should, in a variety of ways, demonstrate high regard and respect for the professional psychologist; it should include providing respected status for professionals on program staffs, appropriate rewards for professional activities, etc.

3. There should be professional training at the several educational levels: AA, BA, MA, and doctoral; the Conference advocates wider use of the PsyD designation for doctoral training for professional practice (as distinguished from PhD for training the scientist or the scientist-practitioner). The fields of professional psychology should become so constructed as to permit the concept of a **career lattice** (as distinct from a **career ladder**) permitting both upward and horizontal mobility in career development.

4. At all levels, professional training should include significant and extensive field experience, and such experience should be integrated with formal classroom instruction. Field experience should occur in both traditional and non-traditional settings and should be linked with "service delivery systems extrinsic to the program."

5. Requirements for professional training should be functionally related to the professional roles defined by the program objectives; at the doctoral level, such requirements should be both broad and basic.

6. Training institutions should develop and participate in functionally useful, multidisciplinary programs of continuing education; institutional faculties should also receive opportunities for further training in their "continuing professional development."

7. All doctoral level students should "receive explicit education in the evaluation of the effectiveness of professional interventions."

8. Entry level to "journeyman" status as a psychologist should be at the MA level, with appropriate distinguishing adjectives; revisions of membership regulations and of licensing laws should be at the MA level, with appropriate distinguishing adjectives; revisions of membership regulations and of licensing laws should be undertaken to this end.

9. University programs should "inform themselves about existing and even expanding societal needs . . ." such as "needs for persons trained in personnel psychology, the demands for persons in the field of prison psychology, in psychological problems in transportation, and in several underserved populations," i.e., the programs should look for and develop markets in which their graduates can be placed and can serve useful functions for society.

10. In many specific forms, the Conference recommends that APA and the individual institutions step up action aimed at increasing minority representation, and that there be increased concern for psychology's effects on minorities and a pluralistic society.

11. Training institutions, and particularly graduate programs, must

(Continued on Page 40)



# **The Twenty-Second Annual WORKSHOP IN INDUSTRIAL AND ORGANIZATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY**

The 22nd Annual Division 14 Workshops will be held in New Orleans, La. on Thursday, August 29, 1974 at the Marriott Hotel. The sessions and leaders will be as follows:

## **SECTION I**

### **THE SCIENCE AND POLITICS OF SELECTION**

**Dr. Mary Tenopyr**  
AT&T

**Mr. George Cooper**  
Columbia University Law School

This workshop will attempt to relate the political aspects of the law to the psychological implementation of selection practices. Covered in the workshop will be:

1. Definition of a test
2. Definition of discrimination
3. Validation models
4. Differential prediction.

Mr. Cooper and Dr. Tenopyr will alternately discuss the effects which law and the scientific approach have on selection in each of the above categories.

Dr. Tenopyr is currently Manager - Human Resource Research at American Telephone and Telegraph Co. Her past work affiliations include the U.S. Civil Service Commission, Rockwell International and the U.S. Air Force. A recognized expert in the selection area, Dr. Tenopyr has served on the Testing and Selection Advisory Committee for the U.S. Department of Labor and as a consultant for the State of California Fair Employment Practices Commission.

Mr. Cooper, who received his LL.D. from Harvard University, has been on the Law Faculty at Columbia University since 1968. He has been a Litigation Consultant to the NAACP Legal Defense Fund and a member of the Board of Directors of the New York Civil Liberties Union, among other activities. He is the author of numerous books and publications and has been involved in major litigations regarding employment testing.

**WORKSHOP COMMITTEE COORDINATOR: Dr. Lawrence Bollinger.**  
Enrollment limited to 30 participants.

## **SECTION II**

### **PRACTICAL APPROACHES TO JOB ANALYSIS**

**Mr. Ernest Primoff**  
U.S. Civil Service Commission

**Dr. L. Rogers Taylor**  
State Farm Ins. Co.

**Mr. Evan Lewis**  
State of Washington

As a result of the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's guideline requirements to show the relevance of selection procedures to work performed, job analysis is now more important than ever.

Three approaches growing out of the occupational research program of the U.S. Employment Service in the 1930s have in recent years had considerable application. They are the job element (J-Coefficient) approach of Ernest Primoff, functional job analysis (FJA) developed by S. A. Fine and the Position Analysis Questionnaire (PAQ) by Ernest McCormick. This workshop will describe applications and results of these three approaches.

Mr. Primoff has been with the U.S. Civil Service Commission since 1944

where he developed the job element approach following upon his work in the U.S. Employment Service. Currently he is Chief of the Personnel Testing and Standards Research Unit of the Test Development Section. He was also Adjunct professor of Psychology at American University and has served as a consultant to numerous organizations.

Dr. Taylor will report on his intensive applied research with the PAQ at State Farm where he is currently Director of Research. Dr. Taylor, who received his Ph.D. from Purdue University, was one of the first researchers in a major organization to analyze jobs via the PAQ and apply the results to solving selection research problems.

Mr. Lewis, with the Department of Personnel in the Civil Service of the State of Washington, will describe the applications of FJA to oral interview testing. His background includes work in the areas of test development, wage analysis and human factor management.

**WORKSHOP COMMITTEE COORDINATOR: Dr. Sidney Fine.**  
Enrollment limited to 20 participants.

## **SECTION III**

### **ORGANIZATIONAL DIAGNOSIS AND DEVELOPMENT**

**Dr. Harry Levinson**  
Levinson Institute

In this workshop, Dr. Levinson will present his approach to the diagnosis of organizations. The discussion will focus on defining organizational problems and assessing alternative modes of dealing with them. Several case studies submitted by the workshop participants will be used for demonstration purposes.

Dr. Levinson is president of the Levinson Institute. He was a distinguished visiting professor at Harvard University Graduate School of Business from 1968 to 1972, and he is currently Adjunct Professor at the College of Business Administration of Boston University. He is a Fellow of APA and a fellow or member of several other professional associations. His publications and books on such topics as employee mental health, executive stress and organizational diagnosis are numerous and have earned him awards from the Academy of Management and the McKinsey Foundation.

**WORKSHOP COMMITTEE COORDINATOR: Dr. Gary Yukl.**  
Enrollment limited to 20 participants.

## **SECTION IV**

### **HUMAN RESOURCE ACCOUNTING: METHODS AND MEANING**

**Dr. William Pyle**  
The University of Michigan

Human Resource Accounting (HRA) is a vehicle for recognizing investments in and returns from expenditures for the human component of organizations. The objective of HRA is to improve decision-making through the development and application of advanced measurement, reporting and analytical capabilities for improving return-on-investment (ROI) from human resource programs and activities. At the organizational level, these include selection, training, on-the-job learning and organizational development programs.

Dr. Pyle and representatives of General Motors, GTE, PPG Industries and Texas Instruments will work with workshop participants to increase their capabilities for: (1) launching an HRA pilot project, (2) HRA measurement, reporting and analyses, (3) applying HRA technology to decision areas (e.g. selection, training and organizational development) and (4) assessing the im-

pect of HRA technology on decision-making. Dr. Pyle and company representatives will serve as resources to assist the workshop participants in applying HRA to decision areas of special interest.

Dr. Pyle is Director of the University of Michigan's Human Resource Accounting Program, which is sponsored jointly by the Graduate School of Business Administration and the Institute for Social Research. In 1966, Dr. Pyle and the management of the R. G. Barry Corporation launched a project to develop industry's first human resource accounting system. Since that time, HRA measurement capabilities based upon this work have been instituted in many other organizations in the U.S. and abroad. Dr. Pyle has written and lectured extensively on HRA and is currently completing two books on human resource accounting.

**WORKSHOP COMMITTEE COORDINATOR: Dr. Michael Cooper.**  
Enrollment limited to 30 participants.

## SECTION V

### SELF-PLANNING FOR CAREER UPDATING AND CHANGE

**Dr. Robert F. Morrison**  
University of Toronto

**Dr. Walter D. Storey**  
General Electric Company

This workshop will deal with two aspects of individual career development: (1) research findings on environmental and personal factors which affect individual career planning and (2) the application of concepts and theories to the design and implementation of self-directed career planning programs for use by organizations.

Participants will get a hands-on feel of a self-directed career planning program and have an opportunity to experience and discuss some of the exercises. Dialogues of research findings, considerations in the design of career planning materials and implementation of programs within an organization will be encouraged.

Dr. Morrison is Associate Professor of Organization Behavior, Faculty of Management Studies, University of Toronto. He teaches in the areas of organizational behavior and manpower management and planning. Dr. Morrison's recent research has been directed toward adult career choice and development, examining such variables as career paths, the adaptation of individuals to managerial careers and the characteristics of women who choose managerial jobs.

Dr. Storey is Manager, Career Planning and Organizational Development Operations, Corporate Education Services, General Electric Company. His recent work can best be illustrated by his publications: **Career Development Program** and **Career Action Planning**, both published by the General Electric Company.

**WORKSHOP COMMITTEE COORDINATOR: Dr. James L. Farr.**  
Enrollment limited to 20 participants.

## SECTION VI

### STRATEGY AND POLITICS OF PERSONNEL RESEARCH

**Dr. Forrest Fryer**  
First National City Bank

**Dr. Selig M. Danzig**  
General Electric

Applied behavioral scientists in industry are often unsuccessful in their attempts to investigate a problem or do problem-solving research because they do not adequately account for factors extraneous to the experimental variables. For example, it is often crucial for a researcher to get tangible indicators of support for a project from top management, as opposed to merely

routine verbal support, but the researcher must know how to do this effectively if he is to establish a power-base. In a sense, the applied behavioral scientists must walk the fine line between being effective and being disliked. Too often, the strategy of applied personnel research is neglected for the tactics of research design. Instead, a better balance must be obtained or there will be too many false starts, diluted research efforts, and interrupted projects. Alternative strategies will be discussed and evaluated in the light of socio-political factors and research goals.

Dr. Fryer is currently Vice President - Personnel Development and Evaluation at First National City Bank. He was formerly with Xerox Corporation. Well known as a researcher, he has also had extensive experience in defining problems relevant to management groups and in implementing the results of research projects.

Mr. Danzig is Manager - Employee Relations, Planning, Administration and Research at General Electric Corporation.

**WORKSHOP COMMITTEE COORDINATOR: Dr. Melvin Sorcher.**  
Enrollment limited to 20 participants.

\* \* \*

Each workshop session enrollment is limited and **early registration** is advised. Workshop participants will be assigned to the workshop of their choice on the basis of date of receipt of registration.

Registration fee is \$50.00 for APA members and \$75.00 for non-APA members. Participants may invite a guest to the social hour following the workshops. The fee is \$7.00 for the first guest and \$10.00 for each additional guest.

## REGISTRATION FORM NEXT PAGE

### Program Schedule August 29, 1974

8:30 a.m. - 9:00 a.m.	Registration
9:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m.	Workshop Sessions
6:00 p.m. - 8:00 p.m.	Social Hour

Arrangements Coordinator: Dr. Robert Dugan

For additional information, contact the Workshop Committee Chairperson: Dr. Virginia E. Schein, Personnel Research - 7Y, Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., One Madison Avenue, New York, N. Y. 10010, 212-578-3405.

The American Board of Professional Psychology, Inc. (ABPP) is accepting applications for candidacy for its diploma in Clinical Psychology; Counseling Psychology; Industrial and Organizational Psychology; and School Psychology. Interested Psychologists may obtain the necessary information and forms from: Mark H. Lewin, Ph. D., Executive Secretary, 185 Broad Street East, Rochester, N.Y. 14604.

## EARLY REGISTRATION

22nd Annual Workshop in

Industrial and Organizational Psychology

Marriott Hotel, New Orleans, La.

August 29, 1974

Please Print

Name \_\_\_\_\_

Mailing Address \_\_\_\_\_

Rank order below the workshops you would be interested in attending:

( ) Section I - The Science and Politics of Selection

( ) Section II - Practical Approaches to Job Analysis

( ) Section III - Organizational Diagnosis and Development

( ) Section IV - Human Resource Accounting: Methods and Meaning

☒ Section V - Self-Planning for Career Updating and Change

( ) Section VI - Strategy and Politics of Personnel Research

### REGISTER EARLY!!!

\$50 APA members

\$75 Non-APA members

\$7 or \$10 Guest - Social Hour

Make check or money order payable to:

APA DIVISION 14 WORKSHOP COMMITTEE

Mail this form with your fee to:

Dr. James A. Thurber, Treasurer

337 Forest Hills Drive

Elmira, N. Y. 14905

## Recent EEO Court Decisions

Robert M. Guion

Bowling Green State University

Perusal of court decisions creates new respect for attorneys; they must make sense of trends in legal decisions without the data used in reaching those decisions. It is frustrating to read that a test does or does not comply with the Guidelines when little, or no, or only garbled information about the test and its evidence of validity is presented.

Nevertheless, an attempt will be made to bring readers of **TIP** up to date in this area. This review is restricted to decisions published in **Fair Employment Practice Cases** since October, 1972 (volumes 5 and 6) by the Bureau of National Affairs. (To save space, citations will consist only of volume and initial page numbers.) Only technical issues will be reviewed; omitted are such clearly important issues as back pay and other remedies. **Validity and Job Relatedness**

The issue was well stated by the District Court decision in **Harper v. Mayor & City Council** (5-1050); reference is to a firefighting expert who, in evaluating the civil service examination, "concluded that the test was definitely job related. His comments amount to an articulation of an assumption that the kind of aptitude which written general aptitude tests measure is a valid indicator of success as a firefighter. He cannot be faulted for that assumption. It is common enough. But the law does not afford public employers the luxury of reliance on an untested assumption when the tests which proceed from that assumption adversely affect one racial group."

The law is clear and is clearly interpreted; if there is an adverse effect, the employer (public or private) had better not go into court without competent evidence that the employment practice creating the effect is indeed valid. In fact, to one judge, adverse effect alone seemed to have been adequate base for judgment against the employer (**U.S. v. Detroit Edison**, 6-612).

Validity and job relatedness generally seem to be used interchangeably (see, e.g., **Vulcan Society v. Civil Service Commission**, 5-1229, or **Head v. Timkin Roller Bearing**, 6-803). "Job relatedness" does seem, however, to have some residual additional meaning in some decisions. For example, in **U.S. v. Inspiration Cooper** (6-939), the judge prohibited test use until a validation study had been approved by the Court, but he subsequently mentioned certain "job related tests" developed for training programs to assess progress or to certify journeyman status as exceptions to the rule. The exception did not arise because of the Court's assumption of job relatedness, however; the exception was because these tests had had no showing of adverse effect.

In general, it is still true that one need not show evidence of validity unless there is first a showing of adverse effect (**Patmon v. Van Dorn**, 6-821; **Goodyear v. Gates Rubber Co.**, 6-745; **Woods v. North American Rockwell**, 6-22; **Goodloe v. Martin Marietta**, 5-1046). Unvalidated interim procedures were permitted for permanent promotions in the continuing saga of **Chance v. Board of Examiners** (6-728) because there was no adverse effect.

A showing of adverse effect must be substantial; in a searing decision, one district court said that a test could not be considered discriminatory "merely because some professor hazards the general opinion that minority groups do not do well in such tests. The opinion is too general and wholly unsupported by any facts which lend it any degree of credibility" (**Alamosa City Council v. Colo. Commission**, 6-712).

Adverse effect is usually established with internal statistics, e.g., relative differences in percent rejected. The statistics appropriate to such a deter-



mination may, under limited circumstances, include community ratios; the issue was most clearly stated in **Vulcan Society v. Civil Service Commission** (5-1229): "Most groups have viewed comparisons of this kind as a factor to be considered where the job opportunity in question does not require specialized educational training, but is one open to the general public . . ."

A frequently expressed view, at least in bars around conventions, is that the testers can't win. This is untrue, but, unfortunately, the reasons for "winning" are not always given in judicial decisions. USES tests were declared acceptably validated in **McGaffney v. Southwest Miss. Hospital** (5-1312), Flanagan tests in **Sims v. Sheet Metal Workers** (5-557), the SET battery in **Henderson v. First National Bank** (6-858), and unidentified batteries in **Miles v. duPont** (5-982) and **Head v. Timkin Roller Bearing** (6-803). In **Sims, Henderson, and Head**, outside consultants were called in to do or to supervise the validation; this was apparently unnecessary in **McGaffney** or **Miles**. In each case, "acceptably validated" implies satisfying the Court that the EEOC Guidelines were satisfied.

Of these cases, the only one in which the decision was explained in detail was the **Henderson** case. In this, the proof seems to come in three flavors: (a) fifteen validation studies cited from the SET manual, (b) "the content validity of these tests is almost self-provoking" because they were developed specifically for banks and because George Bennet had, on a specified date, "observed tellers and proof machine operators" to be sure the tested traits were required on the jobs in these specific banks, and (c) local validation studies yielded tetrachoric  $r$ 's of .58 ( $n=31$ ) and .37 ( $n=44$ ) against supervisory ratings. (It is worth noting that the ratings here were probably more casual than those in **Moody v. Albemarle** (5-613), in which evidence of validity was discounted because of the "vague standard" of the ratings. In **Henderson**, criticisms of ratings were ridiculed: "The efforts of plaintiffs to undermine this validation study border on the frivolous.")

It should be noted that the reviewer does not fully understand the situation regarding **Sims**. At the district court level, the tests were accepted as valid and job related. In the Circuit Court's review on appeal, we read, "The findings with respect to the facial fairness and validity of the various tests are findings of fact which are not clearly erroneous" (i.e., the appellate court upholds the lower court). But in the next paragraph we read, "However, it is not enough that the tests be fair and be validated . . . The Equal Opportunity Act of 1964 (sic) is concerned with the consequences of employment practices, and a test which is designed and intended as a neutral measure of job-related skills and knowledge may violate the Act if its actual use furthers racial discrimination" (**Sims v. Sheet Metal Workers**, 6-1141). This statement, which cites the Supreme Court in **Griggs** (3-175), is the only case known to this reviewer to reverse the usual emphasis on adverse effect and validity; somewhat similar, although less clearly so, is **U.S. v. Detroit Edison** (6-612).

More often, defendants lose, largely because they fail to provide evidence of validity in the face of a clear and unambiguous adverse effect. Many recent decisions (e.g., **U.S. v. Inspiration Copper**, 6-939; **U.S. v. Jacksonville Terminal**, 6-850) require that formal tests be abandoned until validity evidence is presented that conforms to the Guidelines. In general, however, that rigor is restricted to the things conventionally called tests; alternative assessment procedures seem less likely to come under the ban. In **Inspiration**, training tests seem to have been accepted as job related simply by declaration. In the latest version of **W.A.C.O. v. Alioto** (6-85), a written examination is challenged, but there is no corresponding challenge to an athletic test or an oral examination, and a high school graduation requirement seem very

satisfying. (This case also involves an interesting lapse of logic. If the Guidelines, which calls for specific rather than general statements of validity, are to govern, then how does one justify generalizing empirical validation across a generic type of test? The judge in this case does precisely that; although tests and answers in San Francisco are published immediately after each examination, the judge says that one exam can be validated and that the validity statement can be generalized to other exams of the "same general type.")

There are other examples of non-test assessments being accepted without critical review of validity. **W.A.C.O.** also approves probationary evaluation. Amount of experience was accepted in **McGaffney** (5-1312). "Precise and reasonable Qualification Standards" were ordered in **Watkins v. Washington** (5-1370), to be submitted for approval to counsel for the plaintiffs. Seniority was considered reasonable in (among others) **U.S. v. NL Industries** (5-823), although in this case the Court ordered that "reasonably objective written standards" be established for promotions and transfers — without specifying what these standards might be of their form.

Courts in general seem to have at least as much trouble with notions of content and construct validity as psychologists. Apparently reading only one sentence on content validity, many judges assert that content validity is acceptable under the Guidelines *only* when empirical validation is not feasible (**Fowler v. Schwarzwald**, 5-270; **Harper v. Mayor & City Council**, 5-1050; **Vulcan Society v. Civil Service Commission**, 5-1229; **W.A.C.O. v. Alioto**, 6-85); authors of these decisions seem not to have read the next sentence, starting, "Evidence of content validity alone may be acceptable . . ."

The **Vulcan Society** decision contains an interesting juxtaposition of content and construct validities, both under the discussion of content validity: "An examination has content validity if the content of the examination matches the content of the job. For a test to be content valid, the aptitudes and skills required for successful examination performance must be those aptitudes and skills required for successful job performance." These two sentences are inconsistent if one distinguishes between job content (behaviors and responsibilities) and the aptitudes and skills necessary to perform that content well. The distinction is probably trivial in the context of this case, however, since the Court found the test construction haphazard, no defense at all for 20% of the test items, and an absence of any sort of empirical supporting data. The decision was affirmed, with further comments on content validity, by the appellate court (6-1045).

Good statements of content and construct validity appear in **Bridgeport Guardians v. Commission** (5-1344) along with a memorable criticism of attempts to create an impression of relevance by including key words or phrases in items. An item for a police examination is in part, "Cartridges cost retail \$3.00 for boxes of 20 . . . How much is saved if . . . ?" The comment: "While policemen do use cartridges, the question has in fact nothing specifically to do with the work of the police. If the word 'Bible' were substituted for 'cartridge,' the answer would be the same but it would hardly be probative of the applicant's fitness for the ministry or even as a Bible salesman."

Worth noting also is a dissenting opinion in **Moody v. Albemarle** (5-613) in which the author apparently would accept evidence on construct validity alone if he were sufficiently convinced that the construct was important; he argued that the mental ability tests in question were demonstrable, reasonable measures of job performance and "proof of their own validation" because the job obviously requires intelligence. "My understanding is that a test cannot be declared discriminative if it searches for an indispensable factor of the job," he wrote.

Consideration of validity has rarely included issues of differential validity. It was not technically feasible in **Henderson**, but it may have required by implication in a number of cases where the Court ordered test validation in accordance with the Guidelines. In only one case noted by this reviewer was differential validity given major billing in the decision; that was **U.S. v. Detroit Edison** (6-612). In a decision which defines validity as the 5% level of significance, the Court also said that the Guidelines absolutely require differential validation. One wonders from the wording about the clarity of the concept as the opinion was written; e.g., "Differential validity must also be accomplished . . ."

#### Measurement of Performance

For most psychologists, the first sign of a challenge of performance ratings was in the decision in **Moody v. Albemarle** (5-613), although it had been foreshadowed in **Rowe v. General Motors** (4-445). The Court in **Rowe** found that a performance review system was too vague, subjective, and unsystematic for use in transfer and promotion where its effect was adverse for a minority group. Going a step further, the Fourth Circuit Court of Appeals in **Moody** declared unlawful a test that had been conventionally validated. The study was not elegant, but it was probably solid. It used criterion ratings by independent supervisors on: "Excluding a man's attitude, just how well the guy can do the job when he's feeling right." As ratings go, this is a cut above most; it does attempt to distinguish the motivational components of performance from the ability component in evaluating ability rather than motivational predictors. The District Court had not ordered changes in the testing program or its abolition (4-561), but the appellate court reversed the decision, largely on the grounds that the criteria had been developed without job analysis: "... test results were compared with possibly subjective ratings of supervisors who were given a vague standard by which to judge performance." A dissenting opinion, already noted, took issue: "... the equivalent of job analysis was utilized. In rating the employee, the jobs' features were undeniably considered, for the supervisors were unquestionably familiar with these elements."

A further step still is **Brito v. Zia** (5-1203), in which tests (as we ordinarily think of them) were not at issue. This was a case of reduction in force; decisions were based on supervisory performance ratings, consistently termed in the decisions at both district and appellate levels as the "performance evaluation test." Adverse effect was shown, and the burden shifted to a requirement — a logical extension of the Guidelines and its broad definition of test — that the validity of the performance ratings be shown. The decision of the Tenth Circuit (5-1207) summarizes: "The test was not administered and scored under controlled and standardized conditions, with proper safeguards to protect the security of test scores and to insure that the scores did not enter into any judgments of employee adequacy that are to be used as criterion measures as required by sec. 1607.5(b) for the minimum requirements for validation." One wonders what that statement means in operation. It is reasonable to assume that some validity statement be made in such a situation where there is clear adverse effect, but it also betrays confusion when the parallel between the validity of tests and the validity of criteria is carried so far that precautions must be taken to assure that these criterion "scores" do not enter into any criterion judgments!

A somewhat different challenge to criteria appeared in **Harper v. Mayor & City Council** (5-1050). Here the Court rejected validation of a test against a criterion which was also a test, taken at the end of six months in the fire school. The objection was not to common method variance, however, but to what the Court considered poor quality in test construction.

The progression is sure: In **Griggs** it was shown that employment decision tools should be demonstrably valid. In **Georgia Power**, it was shown that evidence of validity should conform to certain standards. In this series of cases, it is shown that empirical evidence of validity must be based on research done with an adequate criterion. So what is new? Only that judges (in the Fourth Circuit, at least) use standards for judging criterion adequacy different from those used by psychologists.

Absence of job analysis has also been noted with regard to test construction. A civil service examination for firemen was attacked in the decision in **Fowler v. Schwarzwald** (5-270) because no adequate job analysis had been done; there were job specifications, but their inadequacy was attested to by additions to the list being developed in testimony.

#### Cutting Scores and Quotas

Where cutting scores are used, validity information should be appropriate to them (**U.S. v. Georgia Power Co.**, 5-587). Where the cutting score is in a distribution has not, however, occasioned much judicial notice. One major exception is **U.S. v. Detroit Edison** (6-612), in which it is asserted that a "reasonable cut-off score should eliminate only those applicants who are likely to be insufficiently qualified to perform the job satisfactorily." What is explicitly stated here can be inferred in other decisions, especially some involving civil service jurisdictions: One way to alleviate at least part of an adverse impact is to seek people who can do the job satisfactorily, not necessarily with excellence or distinction. In **Detroit Edison**, the point is unambiguous: "The continued use of these test batteries, **even if demonstrated to be valid predictors of job success**, without adjusting their cut-off scores to a more reasonable level, is unlawful" (*italics added*).

In civil service cases, where candidates are often taken from the top of an eligibility list, the same issue leads to quotas, a term that seems generally unpleasant to judges. In **W.A.C.O. v. Alioto** (6-85), the District Judge is determined to avoid quotas: "A quota system should be avoided, even if legal, unless necessary as a last resort." For him, a not-quite-last resort is his order to use selection procedures that are potentially invalid so long as they have no adverse effect.

In Cleveland case (**Shield Club v. City of Cleveland**, 5-566), there was no coyness. An outright 18% quota (plus or minus one percent) was established. If the City did not hire 188 new police officers, it could lose a grant; this, one might assume, is an example of "business necessity"! Examination validations were underway, but the new officers had to be hired before the validation could be completed; the quota was a direct solution, albeit an interim solution.

A different situation existed in **Bridgeport Guardians v. Commission** (5-1344): The City been using an "archaic" examining procedure for entry into the police force; job relatedness of promotional examinations was accepted at the appellate level. The Second Circuit Court of Appeals therefore ordered quotas for the entry level jobs only, and it did that with some apparent reluctance: "We agree of course that hiring quotas are discriminatory since they deliberately favor minority groups on the basis of color . . . While we approve such relief somewhat gingerly, we do not believe that Judge Newman abused his discretion in imposing the quotas in hiring here." However, they did not allow quotas for promotion: "We see no purpose in curing a past mischief by imposing a new one . . ." One additional quotation from this decision, without comment: "... time-in-grade criteria have an obvious job relatedness."

### Business Necessity

A doctrine of business necessity is at this point too confused and too serious for this reviewer to untangle. In the Eighth Circuit, at least, the term is routinely modified by the term "compelling." In overturning a lower court decision which spoke of "business purpose" (somewhat vaguely, it should be added), the Court of Appeals reaffirmed its very rigorous notion that a compelling business necessity is one of "irresistible demand," one which not only fosters safety and efficiency but is essential to them (*U.S. v. NL Industries*, 5-823). This poses issues of criterion determination which, as yet, have not appeared in court.

The same problem is, however, posing extremely serious dilemmas for judges in police and fire cases. The business necessity doctrine was discussed in *Harper*, and the Court was unwilling to jeopardize the quality of the fire protection of the City. A similar situation appears in *W.A.C.O.* In the most recent decision (*W.A.C.O. v. Alioto*, 6-1270), the judge shows clearly the bind he is in. He is clearly concerned that the City has the fire fighting force it needs, and he also wants to wait until there is an empirical validation of the examination before approving it. He can't have both. As mentioned earlier, he is, therefore, willing to order the use of unvalidated (and perhaps unvalidatable) procedures in the interim — an order which has the appearance of judicial cop-out.

The dilemma — the choice between excellence in the goods and services provided the citizenry and swift movement toward genuine equality of job opportunity — may be expected to become more difficult rather than less. One looks forward (as an interested spectator, not as a participant) to the day when some unfortunate judge must first grapple with the still more difficult dilemma posed by the differing and competing concepts of fairness.

## Membership Drive Announced

by Paul Wernimont

The Membership Committee of Division 14 would like to encourage all Division members to assist in increasing membership in the Division. Any current APA member or associate who operates in the general field of industrial and organizational psychology is eligible.

Through published works, reputation as a practitioner, or activity in business or other organizational circles, you may know of someone who fits this description. Would you please ask possible members if they are interested, and if so, send the name and address of the prospective member or associate member to me? I will then forward all application materials to that person.

The Committee also encourages endorsers to take their job seriously. We have many applications pending because endorsers have not responded. If you are asked to endorse an applicant to Division 14, please do so as soon as possible.

## FAIR EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES: SOME EDITORIAL COMMENTS

by Michael J. Kavanagh

The previous two issues of *TIP* contained two articles (a letter from *George G. Gordon* in the December issue and a "View From the Underside" from *Richard S. Barrett* in the August issue) from psychologists on the "front line" of compliance with EEOC guidelines. Finding their comments to be quite stimulating, and considering the relevance of this topic for I-O psychologists today, it seems worthwhile to interject some comments in the hope of eliciting further reader response.

The above two articles at first seem to counterbalance each other. Dr. Gordon's letter is a response to Dr. Barrett's earlier comments. Furthermore, Barrett has worked for plaintiffs in court cases while Gordon has worked for employers, thus representing different perspectives on the issue of fair employment practices. However, close examination of their comments indicates they are addressing different facets of the same issue — the inadequacy of test validation in industry. Their differences may reflect the possible causes for the problems that have developed relative to fair employment practices. Let's first re-examine their positions separately.

In the beginning of his article, Dr. Barrett notes that he does not see (in court) the "employers who run the better selection and employment programs", but only the ones that have inadequate programs — thus, a pathological view. However, he provides fairly dramatic evidence from 25 court cases of inadequate work which has contributed to unfair employment procedures. The oft-heard complaint is that the EEOC has been unjustified in "persecuting" organizations over their employment procedures, but the experiences reported by Dr. Barrett indicate there is at least some justification for the

actions of EEOC. However, keep in mind that his is a pathological view. By exclusion, there are a large number of companies who are "healthy" in respect to compliance with Title VII.

Nevertheless, a persistent and troubling thought comes to mind. Could it be that the practice of psychology in industry has been, in some cases, so concerned with meeting organizational goals that scientific principles have suffered? Dr. Barrett's examples seem to indicate that the application of psychology to test validation and selection in industry has drifted away from that prescribed by the *Standards for Educational Tests and Measurements*, if it were ever there in the first place.

Dr. Barrett's comments notwithstanding, one gets the impression that even though the EEOC effort has resulted in negative reactions from many, there have been some positive reactions and certain positive effects. I suspect that companies with properly validated selection programs are smirking a bit. But more importantly, it may be that the EEOC and the courts are causing a needed re-examination and reformation of testing practices in industry — something it appears the profession has been unable to accomplish on its own.

*George Hay*, responding to Dr. Barrett's comments, sees the inadequacy of testing programs resulting from different factors. He lays part of the blame on the inability of scientists to provide applications and techniques that are adequate for the situation faced by the practitioner. He writes from a "sense of frustration" over some of the questionable validation work done in industry. But responding in defense of practitioners, Dr. Hay



argued that part of the problem is due to the dictates and demands of the scientific community. He identified three factors that have made scientifically proper validation studies difficult in practice: inappropriate validation models, inadequate criteria, and the knowledge gap between scientists and practitioners. It is Dr. Hay's argument that academic, scientific I-O psychologists do not realize the difficulties involved in implementing their prescriptions — a point with some validity and worth considering.

The messages from Drs. Barrett and Hay seem clear — both academicians and practitioners alike need to re-examine their ideas on the procedures for establishing the appropriate evidence that a given employment practice is fair. It is incorrect to place all the blame on the courts and the EEOC, just as it is incorrect to place all the blame on I-O practitioners. Both academicians and practitioners must come together as psychologists to deal with this problem. As discussion starters, let's consider the following ideas.

**Howard Lockwood** (TIP, December, 1972) suggests that we need to re-design tests so that they are "more appropriate for the selection of applicants for specific jobs." This suggests that we should substitute a reading test for an intelligence test if reading is the skill necessary for the specific job under consideration. Over-specification of needed skills (e.g., the Griggs case) seems to be a frequent problem. Perhaps the well-developed and documented test is chosen by the practitioner even though the abilities measured by the test are inappropriate (e.g., too high level) for the given job. Building tests on the basis of clear identification of the skills necessary for the job requirement should help us to develop and/or select the proper test. In fact, Mr. Lockwood implies this procedure might generate acceptable court evidence for demonstration of fair employment practices.

Dr. Hay suggests that "the profession must begin to go on record in stating what kinds of abilities are related to specific types of job requirements." It seems that the work of **Ed Fleishman** and his associates on a "behavior taxonomy for human tasks", and the work of **Ernest McCormick** and his associates with the Position Analysis Questionnaire are examples of efforts in this direction. There are, of course, others who have worked or are working in this area. But we might ask an even more pointed question: Should we, as a professional society, develop and certify lists of abilities required by tasks? Is this not reasonable considering the present methods for large scale data collection and storage? Would private industries be willing to release the information necessary for this compilation and finally, how would this be funded?

Another suggestion from Dr. Hay involves the work, or more properly, the **lack** of work on synthetic validity. Well-developed procedures for the establishment of synthetic validity would solve a number of problems raised by Dr. Hay. Should we change the orientation of our present research on test validation in selection and concentrate on laboratory settings, trying to maximize the similarity between the lab and real situation? Assuming we find respectable "demonstrated" predictive validity in the lab, can we generalize the findings to an organization and thus use the regression equation to aid in the selection decision? Will this synthetic validation process generate acceptable evidence in the courts?

Dr. Hay's comments regarding the gap between the scientist and the practitioner leads to two suggestions. First, internships should be included in the graduate educational experiences of those aspiring I-O psychologists planning to be involved in industrial practice. Although this is not a new idea, it should merit

greater attention considering Dr. Barrett's examples from his "chamber of horrors". Second, why not start a practitioner - academician exchange? It seems likely that many I-O psychologists of both persuasions would welcome this opportunity. The details would be complex, but considering the importance of bridging this gap and building better understanding Division 14 might be the logical agency to coordinate such a program.

Dr. Barrett's documented incidents lead to another idea. Do we need a periodic review conducted by Division 14 of all I-O psychologists engaged in **any** professional practice, including full-time practitioners and academicians who consult part-time? I am not suggesting a periodic review by means of a test of knowledge as is presently done in some certification programs. Rather, I am suggesting a review and evaluation, every three to five years, of the actual work the individual has been doing. The medical profession, under strong pressures, is now being subjected to a similar review. Are we not coming under some of the same pressures relative to fair employment practices? Should we not institute and control the review process, rather than leaving it to an outside agency? What do you think?

The above ideas and suggestions

are meant to serve as "discussion starters". I'm certain there are other suggestions in the minds of our readers. Over the past year in **TIP** the editors have been concerned with the development of a series devoted to the topic of compliance with Title VII. The goal of this effort has been to deal constructively with an issue that has "shaken the roots" of the profession. Recent articles have indicated two things. First, there is a need for exposure in **TIP** of the problems encountered and solutions developed in dealing with the equal employment guidelines. Second, there are two sides to every controversy, and we (I-O psychologists) need to join together to help resolve this problem.

Finally, I am certain this editorial will elicit reactions from you. That's good, since that is the main purpose of these comments. We would urge that you send me your reactions. We are planning to devote part of the August 1974 issue of **TIP** to your ideas on this topic. If you prefer, your comments will be kept anonymous. What we want, however, are your feelings, reactions, and descriptions of actual incidents. This is too important an issue on which to remain silent.

(Write Dr. Kavanagh at the School of Management, SUNY, Binghamton, N.Y. 13901).

## VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

The Division 14 Public Relations committee seeks volunteers to visit colleges to acquaint psychology majors with the I-O field. Write Dr. **Olga E. Engelhardt**, Department of Psychology, North Central College, Naperville, Illinois 61820.

## CLASSIFIEDS

### Positions Available

**Assistant Professor, Industrial/Organizational Psychology.** As a member of a long and well-established program, teach undergraduate and graduate courses in industrial/organizational psychology, guide graduate students, conduct research involving graduate students in field rather than laboratory situations. Contact: Dr. Frederic R. Wickert, Chairman, Industrial/Organizational Psychology Search Committee, Department of Psychology — Olds Hall, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI 48824.

**Industrial-Organizational Psychologist.** Recent promotion creates opening for Ph.D. qualified to plan and conduct innovation research on complex problems of management and sales employee selection. Strong research background and skills required. An equal opportunity employer. Reply Box 1A, **TIP**.

**The Psychology Department** of the University of Maryland, College Park, has an opening on the faculty beginning August 15, 1974 for an Assistant Professor. Applications considered in quantitative psychometric measurement with a subject or content area in research in organization - industrial psychology or related. Criteria will be outstanding promise in teaching and research, willingness to provide service support in measurement and statistics to students in other content and applied areas of psychology. Teaching responsibilities include quantitative methods and statistics, psychometric measurement, industrial - organizational or related content areas in psychology at the undergraduate and graduate levels. An equal opportunity affirmative action employer. An application will consist of a vita, reprints of papers, and four letters of recommendation from professionals giving critical appraisal of the applicant's achievements and promise as a researcher and teacher. Applications should be sent to: Dr. C. J. Bartlett, Department of Psychology, University of Maryland, College Park, MD. 20742.

**Large financial organization** in NYC seeks Ph. D. to carry out projects in all areas of personnel research with special emphasis on assessment centers, manpower planning, attitude surveys, performance appraisal, job analysis, etc. Individual should have good statistical and experimental design skills, be capable of dealing with management at all levels and have an interest in administering research activities. Will consider new Ph. D.'s. Advancement potential excellent. Please send resume and salary requirements to: Dr. V. E. Schein, Personnel Research, Metropolitan Life Ins. Co., 1 Madison Ave., New York, NY 10010.

**The Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign** is seeking a new Ph. D. in psychology or a closely allied field to fill a regular budgeted position of Assistant Professor in organizational/industrial psychology with a salary of \$12,250 for nine months. The starting date is August 21, 1974. The candidate will teach existing undergraduate and graduate courses in a number of areas of organizational/industrial psychology including field research methods, as well as to develop courses in his own specialty. In addition, the candidate will direct research of both graduate and undergraduate students. The area of specialization is of less concern than the research and teaching promise. Published, high-quality work in refereed journals, and documentable teaching effectiveness will be major considerations. A candidate who complements the teaching and research interests of the present three-person organizational/industrial faculty would be given most serious consideration. The department is especially interested in strengthening the content areas of assessment and evaluation of organizational change and intervention (including OD, job enrichment, and communication network change and analysis), systems evaluations, and motivation theories. An equal opportunity/affirmative action employer; encouraged from minority group members and women. Interested persons should send vita to Professor Charles L. Hulin, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, Sixth and Daniels Streets, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

### Position Wanted

**Industrial/Organizational Psychologist** seeks position in an applied setting. Interests are in organizational and personnel psychology, especially motivation. Heavy experimental and quantitative background, plus extensive field experience. Ph.D. expected in August, 1974. For further information contact Clarence W. Von Bergen, Jr., Department of Psychological Sciences, Purdue University, W. Lafayette, Indiana 47907.

### ADVERTISE IN TIP

For information on advertising rates, write the Editor or the Advertising Manager. Space available by half or full page; rates variable by number of insertions and location.

## 1973 Division 14 Convention Program: Just Dandy

by Michael J. Kavanagh

My overall reaction to the 1973 program in Montreal is best summarized by the phrase "just dandy". This relatively non-scientific (and even non-behavioral) analysis seems to best describe my feelings about the excellence of the program developed by **Mike Beer** and the Program Committee. All the sessions I attended (or attempted to) overflowed the seating capacity of the assigned rooms — a sure sign of success. In fact, finding it difficult to write while standing, I solicited comments for two symposia from seated individuals (see **Marshall Sashkin** on "The Giant Gropes and the Field Advances" and **Fred Wickert** on "Humanizing Organizational Psychology" in this issue). My sincere thanks goes to them.

In addition to my overall impression, several other personal observations emerged from the sessions that I attended. Although much of the research was aimed at rather specific and narrow hypotheses, an encouraging sign was that many of the reports were theory-based, and others were parts of larger, long-term research efforts. In addition, going to a more relaxed presentation (small group discussion, etc.) greatly improved the paper sessions.

Perhaps the major theme that ran through much of the program was the gap (difference? conflict?) between theory and practice in I-O psychology. Although this issue was the topic of an entire symposium ("The Practice of Science in Industrial and Organizational Psychology", starring **Milt Blood**, **Karlene Roberts** and **Chuck Hulin** with **John Campbell** as Chair), it kept appearing in some form at the strangest places. For example, at the open forum with the Executive Committee of Division 14 (by the way — an excellent idea — let's hope it con-

tinues in the future), it struck me that theorists and practitioners were on opposite sides of the fence on this issue.

In the midst of my somewhat crumpled notes (stained with French pastries and red wine — a delightful wake-up) an underlined statement tells me that the entire general issue is "Should Division 14 become **formally** and **actively** involved in professional affairs such as certification and licensure, court cases, interlinks with government agencies.?" I remember responding decidedly "Yes" to this question, which led **Art MacKinney**, the spoilsport sitting next to me, to quietly ask "How do we get the money?" This might be the crux of the issue. If Division 14 is to take an active role in professional affairs (independent of CAPPS), it is going to cost many dollars. Now — do you want this, or is individual action through CAPPS or other individual avenues sufficient?

Returning to the science-practice debate, it appeared again during the discussion period of a session on performance appraisal (Performance Appraisal Methodology: Issues and Applications). After the participants spent over an hour extolling the virtues of the "retranslation of expectations" method for developing performance rating scales, the audience criticized some aspects of their work. Perhaps most cogent to the science-practice problem were the comments by **Orlo Crissey**, emphasizing the gap between theoretically - developed techniques and the "real world". My understanding of his comments was that merely using this technique of "retranslation of expectations," on the basis of its validity in research and theory, does not guarantee its validity in a particular applied set-

(Continued on Page 36)

## Comments on an A.P.A. (Montreal) Symposium "Humanizing Organizational Psychology"

by Frederic R. Wickert

Several of the more important ways industrial/organizational psychology should be "humanizing" — and nothing is escaping humanizing pressures these days — emerged in a joint Division 13 - Division 14 symposium at the Montreal convention. The symposium was chaired by **Hy Meltzer**, contributions were made by **Harry Levinson**, **Ed Lawler**, **Tim Hall**, and **Fred Wmassarik**, while the author of this summary, **Fred Wickert**, was discussant.

For Harry Levinson a humanizing organizational psychology would make a point of recognizing the three somewhat Freudian phases each manager goes through during the course of his working career: (1) early phase, when he is trying himself out and learning organizational as well as job skills; (2) mid-career, when he fills the quasi-parent role of leading early career people and at the same time identifying strongly with organizational demands and needs; and (3) late career, when he is no longer competing but is in a position to counsel and plan. A humanizing organizational psychology would work toward designing organizations to utilize their members in ways appropriate to these three career stages and not inappropriately as they now all too often do.

Ed Lawler's concern was less for managers and more for the usually expected beneficiary of a humanizing program, the blue-collar worker. While utilizing organizational psychology research and action programs, organizations would be individualized or humanized by (1) assessing individual differences in organization members, as much in their motivations as in their competences, (2) assessing critical dif-

ferences in tasks, jobs, and organizational design, and then (3) matching these two sets of differences across the whole, complex ever-changing organization. A possible fourth step would involve recognizing that matching the two sets of differences involves a mind-boggling mass of detail that would necessitate judicious generalizing and simplifying, (like, on the task side, simplifying jobs by putting them in suitable modules) to make the program practical. Ed made explicit the incredible number of details involved in taking this usually thought of but not always too well thought through path to humanizing work. Now that Ed has shown us what all is involved, we should ask ourselves whether this is the way to go.

Tim Hall's focus was not on all managers like Levinson, or blue-collar employees like Lawler, but on young managers. These young managers show serious frustration at the slow rate of established organizations' acceptance of humanizing values. Society could be seriously damaged if organizational psychology does not make a special effort to teach young managers how to use organizational psychology's tested social change methods.

Fred Massarik drew attention not to what was involved in humanizing organizations for the benefit of some one class of organization member as the other three contributors tended to do but rather to the "Humanistic Organization." The H. O. is balanced; it is dominated neither by extreme structure nor by extreme ambiguity. To be too ambiguous, that is, to emphasize the individual too much, would be "humanistically dysfunctional." It is the dynamic system as a functioning whole that is

(Continued on Page 35)

## The Giant Gropes And The Field Advances by Marshall Sashkin

It would seem that even in an industrial bureaucracy larger than that of some nations change can occur. Yet, the title of this session (at Montreal) was well-selected, for the GM giant is, indeed, groping; sometimes painfully and oftentimes with little effect, but an inch of movement in GM may be as heartening as the miles in such organizations as Donnelly Mirrors or the Harwood Co. **Mike Beer** started this session with about a dozen well-taken questions; surprisingly, the presentors made at least a start at answering about two-thirds of them. My greatest annoyance was the design of the session, or, more accurately, the fact that the design was not followed. In part, this was due to the poor physical facilities — a room of concrete and tile with uncomfortable chairs and about half the needed size. As usual, the speakers could not limit themselves to their assigned 10 minutes and the promised small group discussions never materialized. I am convinced that session chairmen should be issued raucous buzzers or airhorns — and, perhaps, the guts to use them.

But I'm responding to this situation using what **Chris Argyris** defined as a "Model I" theory, which involves an action strategy of maximizing one's control of a situation and minimizing the control of others. ("Toward a Theory of Practice: Changing Human Behavior — A Cognitive Approach") Of course, this is the way paper sessions — and the world, as Argyris observes — are defined. However, to accept and act in this framework keeps one forever in a Model I situation and makes Model II impossible. Model II, an ideal normative model, is based on Argyris' latest work, **Intervention Theory and Method**, but goes beyond this, most clearly in his concept of "double-loop learning." I'm not sure

I fully understand this idea, but it seems to involve the use of observed data to test both "espoused" and "in use" theories, to confirm or disconfirm the effectiveness of specific behavioral strategies, and to redesign one's own theories of concept and practice. Through double-loop learning in Model II one can question not only one's action-strategies but question, test, and reconstruct the theories behind action.

Argyris has moved far beyond T-groups for organizational development. The common T-group, too, operates under Model I in practice (while espousing Model II) and **separates** affect from effectiveness. Love, joy, and interpersonal closeness are neither necessary nor unnecessary for change. You do **not** get to Model II by doing the opposite of Model I; such a strategy results in anarchy or vacillation between group control (based on Model I) and leader control (also based on Model I). To get from I to II, Argyris has designed a new type of laboratory learning experience, centered on cognition as well as affect, on task and effectiveness as well as on feelings, and focussing on the discrepancy between the theory each person says he or she believes in and the theory he or she bases behavior on. The result, sometimes painful and generally difficult to attain, is the integration of emotion and intellect, the ability to gather valid data, to use them in actions based on Model II assumptions, and to **learn** from the results of one's behavior by changing one's theory and behavior toward increased effectiveness. Chris Argyris' presentation was, for me, the most exciting of the convention, for I had the hint of a feeling that here was an advance, an idea, an approach whose time was coming, much as Carl Rogers described his feelings about the effect of his own work upon

(Continued on Page 34)



## Giant (Continued)

psychology.

To return to the giant, its gropings, too, have advanced the field, at least indirectly. **Dutch Landen, Alvin Simberg, Howard Carlson, and Drew Danko** presented various portions of an overall summary of the approach and actions taken toward organization development in GM. While not overly exciting or innovative, such description is hopeful; if it can happen at GM perhaps our social order does have survival potential. Yet I can barely suppress a shudder at the thought of the 125 "OD people" now working in that organization. We were told they were "trained" yet I have the image of a bright young manager being tapped by the magic wand of higher authority and told "Arise! You are now an OD specialist!" **Dave Bowers'** report did show that the actions of the outside, "professional" change agents had effects, and that these effects could in fact be linked to the nature of their actions, for better or worse. While the definition of success seemed limited to the observation that the project was "going well," those CA's rated as effective were also more task-problem oriented (rather than pressing for emotional openness), made better use of managerial "opinion leaders," relied more on referent and expert power than on legitimate power, and moved from initially directive actions to ultimately much less directive interventions. (My earlier shudder was, however, reinforced upon hearing that internal change agents received all of two weeks of orientation and training.)

Only **Ren Likert** offered some "hard" data, showing support for his theory from the GM work. He also presented a modified Human Resources Accounting approach, to estimate the actual dollar worth to the organization of effective change, using Survey of Organizations data. Despite the earlier push toward an operational and individualized HRA

system, it doesn't look like managers will soon (if ever) be faced with having a dollar worth figure assigned to them personally. Perhaps Likert's most interesting comment (in response to a question from the floor challenging the completeness of the SOO instrument) was to the effect that job content is not a particularly significant factor in job performance. Many (including myself) seemed unconvinced. Yet, he also noted that survey - feedback data must be **interpretable** — understood by the recipients — and **useful**, which brings us back to Argyris. Valid and useful information, free informed choice, and commitment to decisions, the three basic tasks of the interventionist and the "governing variables" for action in Model II, are terms being used more and more, it seems to me. This, too, I take as a hopeful sign.

The giant is groping, and the field is advancing. I hope these events do not remain independent.

## Grant (Continued)

tour at teaching but decided that the industrial arena was more to my choice.

"At the time of making this career choice I fully realized that progress would be slow. Consequently, I did not suffer from great expectations concerning developments in the application of psychology to organizational problems. Progress has, of course, been slow but sufficient to encourage me in believing that it will continue and probably accelerate in the relatively near future. It is this optimism which makes me somewhat concerned over the readiness of industrial psychologists to capitalize on the needs organizations in our society have for more effective assistance in helping them solve their human resource problems. There are times when I feel that our profession remains relatively immature."

## Humanizing (Continued)

important.

Some conclusions and some far from settled issues that were evident from a look across all four contributions were:

(1) All four were normative and told what should be done to attain Utopia. Unanswered, however, was how to avoid the old problem of the ethics of manipulation as mentioned by Lawler. Furthermore, each Utopia suggests a one best way that eventually is disillusioning. Also unanswered was whether Massarik's systems and balance solution was really the way to go.

(2) The persistent dilemma of the conflict between the individual and the organization did not go away. That it did not would hardly be unexpected in a humanistically oriented symposium. On the whole, again in line with expectations, the organization rather than the individual was pushed rather far into a corner except for Massarik's balance theme.

(3) Despite "Chair" Meltzer's introductory note about humanizing organizations as possibly revolutionary, all four contributors advocated continuous and evolutionary yet dynamic progress toward humanism.

(4) All four contributors generally recognized that no industrial/organizational psychology techniques worked in isolation. Insofar as these four persons are representative of our whole discipline, the conclusion is evident that the field has finally learned this lesson well. One example: organization-dominated selection should be a thing of the past; the field should be working toward enlightened and informed self-selection.

(5) A humanistically-oriented organizational psychology develops a focus on individual careers especially as reflected in the contributions of Levinson and Hall. However, these two contributors were not in agreement with respect to their treat-

ment of younger managers. Levinson appeared to advocate supervising them protectively while Hall would provide them with behavioral science tools to shape situations in such a way as to relieve their current frustrations which could have such potentially damaging consequences to the society.

(6) The symposium hardly settled all the problems involved in humanizing organizations. Perhaps most vexing remained who in organizations was to make the almost overwhelming complex of adjustments to each never completely happy organization member. Moreover, the endless vistas of research needs opened up by Lawler, who would have those of us in organizational psychology work toward identifying and then satisfactorily making the welter of needed individual person and task matchings, would keep us busy forever.

(7) It was also clear that this one symposium had no monopoly of the topic. The topic is currently "in," and the whole A.P.A. program as well as those of Divisions 13 and 14 was peppered with humanistic influences.

## President (Continued)

ple of such action. The group feels, however, that it can now best proceed by working from the vast amount of input which has been received rather than by broadening its membership. Should this situation change, and the group feel the need for consultation with others, I will get in touch with you. In the meantime, I will be happy to keep you informed of progress.

Cordially,

William A. Gorham, Director  
Personnel Research and  
Development Center

ting. The generalizability of the validity of this technique must be tempered by the technique - environment interaction, which certainly must be varied across a continuum of favorability. In fairness, it should be noted that the work reported by the participants was an interesting attempt to bridge the gap between science and practice.

Perhaps the most profound discussion of this issue occurred in the Ed Henry Memorial Address by **Bernie Bass** ("The Substance and the Shadow"). It struck home when Bernie began by stating that "while nothing may be as practical for advancing technology (the substance) as a good scientific theory (the shadow), it is probable that nothing may be as impractical as a bad one." Bernie then criticized the growing split between science and practice and urged us to become "bridge-builders" or "straddlers" by offering some practical suggestions as to how we ought to go about this. (Interested readers should write to Bernie Bass at the University of Rochester for his comments on these matters.)

Returning to the earlier mentioned symposium on this issue, **Milt Blood** (Science and Practice: Vive la Difference"), as his title suggests, felt that this split was fine in terms of stimulating research efforts. Milt concluded by stating that "both kinds of research (basic and applied) are important to our field; there are critical differences between them; vive la difference." One can certainly not easily disagree with this statement in terms of research. However, the extension of this thinking to professional affairs and "science in action" may indicate that "la difference" is causing harm.

Finally, I must comment on the solicited observations of my (seated) friends — Fred Wickert and Marshall Sashkin. One should not miss the cynicism underlying these two reports. Fred discussed the Utopian suggestions of the theoreticians in

terms of their generalizability to applied settings, while Marshall, in the opposite direction, wonders about the inadequacy of application of theory by practitioners when he discusses internal change agents and their training.

Certainly the best way to end this report is on a note of optimism concerning this issue. Marshall Sashkin states that "the giant is groping, and the field is advancing." It is my hope that the field is advancing — toward a unified position on this crucial issue — perhaps toward the center of the bridge.

#### Public Relations Committee (Continued)

Division 14 psychologists to direct their energies where expansion is most likely and information is most needed.

Division 14 members wishing to participate in the visiting I/O program indicate both your willingness to serve and the geographic areas you are most likely to visit this year.

Mail Your Replies To:  
Olga E. Engelhardt, Ph. D.  
Chairperson, Department of Psychology  
North Central College  
Naperville, Illinois 60540

Members who are interested in 1) the writer's markets for non-technical articles on I/O psychology and 2) A "writer's kit" may write to:

Richard O. Peterson, Ph. D.  
Personnel Manager, AT & T  
Room C2273  
195 Broadway  
New York, New York 10007

#### Toops (Continued)

is exclusive of those students Toops influenced and helped make into productive psychologists, effective educators, and good human beings. Among those so honored and benefited, I am confident they themselves would be delighted to acknowledge, are the current President of Division 14 and our President-Elect, **Ed Fleishman** and **Don Grant**, respectively. My wife, Evelyn, and I are also the grateful beneficiaries of the Toopsian tutelage, of this giant of a man for whom no thought was too small to have potential significance, nor any thought so large that he could not demolish it handily with his "refutation" technique.

Yet how sad it is, how very sad, that so many people do not know of

Toops. This is because, prolific as he was, his interests were so wide, including many activities which are preserved at best unsystematically in his ubiquitous blue-boxes, that he did not publish as widely as he might have. Accordingly, a number of people are now resuscitating and pulling together the salvageable treasures that Toops has given us. Among these the one that stands head and shoulders taller than all the rest is his love of ideas and his unmatched facility for helping others crystallize and give birth to their own cognitive progeny, but this, alas, is a trait (he idolized traits, those, that is, surviving his celebrated "L-Method") which, ironic for one like Toops who relied so heavily upon measurement, can scarcely be measured.

February 15, 1974

## Herbert A. Toops Memorial Prize For Creativity

Several noted psychologists, including Division 14 members, are working toward a Herbert A. Toops Memorial Prize for Creativity. This prize will take the form of an annual award to be given by the Department of Psychology, Ohio State University, "to that one of its graduate students or alumni who had shown the greatest creativity during the previous year. The award will be within those areas of psychology which had the greatest interest to Dr. Toops: statistics, psychometrics, counseling and guidance, and human motivation." Money contributed will be invested by the University and the earnings will constitute the award.

The goal is a minimum fund of \$5,000, of which approximately \$4,000 has been donated or pledged. Division 14 members are asked to contribute. Donations should be made payable to the Ohio State University Foundation (with an indication that it is for the Toops Memorial) and sent to: **Dr. Harold A. Edgerton**, 17030 Hierba Drive, San Diego, California 92128.

The other members of the memorial committee include **Wilbur L. Layton**, Iowa State University, **Robert W. Wherry**, Ohio State University, and **Robert and Evelyn Perloff**, University of Pittsburgh.

President (Continued)

that the selection methods used by employers do not discriminate unfairly. However, we feel there are aspects of the present draft which would critically impede the fulfillment of those expectations. Guidelines should encourage rather than discourage the use of more reliable and valid selection procedures. However, as presently constituted, the guidelines would discourage selection research because on many points the standards are unclear, unworkable, unnecessarily negative, and, in places, technically unsound. Adoption of the current draft could, therefore, result in more unfair discrimination, rather than less, and result in less effective use of the nation's human resources.

Guidelines should foster research and development that would, in the future, continue to improve the fairness and effectiveness of selection procedures. These regulations could "freeze" methodology at the present stage of development, contrary to the intent of established public policy.

The pervasive problem in this draft is the attempt to specify a universally applicable set of ideal procedures. This goes beyond what reasonably can be done by regulatory agencies. In so doing, some unworkable guidelines have been created. We need to differentiate between idealized scientific and professional practice, and requirements, designed to insure compliance with the law, that are realistically definable by existing knowledge, methodology and principles of scientific investigation. To create an impossible standard is to invite evasion of and disrespect for the law. We need to distinguish between standards that are rigid and those that are rigorous.

Some examples of critical problems noted in the draft include the following:

1. The definition of "job related" in the draft is unnecessarily restrictive

and technically unsound in that it is based solely on job analysis. By any reasonable definition, any measure that can be shown to be empirically valid is ipso facto job related. Any measure, therefore, that is empirically valid should not have to meet the additional and unnecessary standard of being job related as defined by the draft.

2. The mandatory, rather than recommended, nature of the job analysis requirement for all validation studies is inappropriate. Although job analysis is desirable in some validation situations, e.g., in content validation, the description of job analysis in the draft does not recognize the various methods or levels of such analyses. There are many types of job analysis for different purposes; the guidelines cannot hope to deal with these complex issues. And in many cases job analysis may be irrelevant to a particular validation strategy (e.g., for the prediction of turnover).

3. The concept of differential validity or differential prediction should not be written into the guidelines as though it were a concept or procedure having unequivocal scientific support behind it. Statistical theory, empirical findings, and expert opinion have not yet established the firm consensus that such a regulation would appear to presume.

4. Some of the measurement requirements seem arbitrary and without sufficient justification. It seems ill-advised to specify certain minimum standards with arbitrary cut-off values (e.g., reliabilities of .70, "at least half of the criteria," etc.) unless reference is made to boundary conditions relevant to the situational context.

5. The definition of "test," in the draft, goes far beyond customary professional usage and we are concerned this may unintentionally mislead some into assuming a single model of validation. For example, in-

terviews and reference checks are included within this definition. The validation of such procedures may require different research models than would be used to validate paper and pencil tests. The guidelines should recognize these differences as well as the limitations of different research models appropriate to various selection techniques.

We strongly urge you to consider very carefully the vast amount of material submitted to you by the membership of Division 14, as well as by other interested psychologists, in your further deliberations and draftings of the guidelines. The submissions represent the thinking of some of the most qualified professionals in the area. We believe that the issues raised in these materials show clearly that there are serious problems in the present draft.

Our Division stands willing to assist in the development of improved guidelines. The goals of increased opportunity for all segments of the labor force are mutual ones.

Sincerely yours,

Edwin A. Fleishman  
President

February 7, 1974

Dr. Edwin A. Fleishman, President  
Division of Industrial and  
Organizational Psychology  
American Psychological Association  
c/o American Institutes for Research  
8555 16th Street  
Silver Spring, Maryland 20910

Dear Ed:

The volume and quality of thoughtful suggestions and concerns expressed to the agencies of the Equal Employment Opportunity Coordinating Council, in regard to the Discussion Draft of the proposed

Uniform Guidelines, make it infeasible to respond to each letter with the depth which some of the senders surely expect and deserve. Nevertheless, I am sure that I can express the appreciation of the staff members of the EEOCC for the incisive analyses and constructive suggestions you expressed on behalf of Division 14.

The staff committee is now in the process of revising the Discussion Draft, attempting to take into account the issues raised and points of view expressed by the many commentators. Frankly, I see this as taking quite some time. We have not imposed a deadline on ourselves. I personally feel that to do so might foster forced agreements rather than encourage thorough understanding of the implications of alternatives. The objective is a uniform guideline issuance which will be acceptable to all members of the Council and at the same time responsive to all of our concerns for equal employment opportunity.

As a member of Division 14, as well as a staff member of the group working on the Draft Guidelines, and as an employer, I share your concern about the possible effect of the guidelines on the use of reliable and valid selection procedures and on selection research in general. Guidelines which are either prescriptive or proscriptive are bound to create a negative image and to have a certain chilling effect. I would hope, and will work with the other staff members of the EEOCC to assure that, such effects are minimal.

We appreciate your offer of assistance on the part of the Executive Committee of Division 14. We have no objection to sitting for a limited time with persons who represent larger organizations so they might present points of view which cannot be communicated in writing. The APA meeting here was an exam-

(Continued on Page 35)



## Guion Report (Continued)

pay more attention to the "truth in packaging" concept in advertising their programs.

12. Special attention was given to program evaluation and to alternatives to traditional accreditation. Programs should institute outcome evaluations and five-year follow-up of graduates to determine their effectiveness in the light of well-defined program objectives. Essentially, the recommendation of "product evaluation" is rooted in the concept of accountability.

### Implications for Division 14

1. In general, I recommend a "wait-and-see" attitude; the recommendations are often vague and almost projective in nature. While waiting, however, I think several standing committees should become familiar with the current state of the recommendations and use them as focal points in their deliberations. E & T is specifically concerned, of course; Scientific Affairs, Professional Affairs, Public Policy and Social Action, Public Relations, and Membership committees all have interests relevant to specific recommendations.

2. Specifically, either standing or ad hoc committees should deal with these questions: (a.) What is the "root of comprehensive psychological knowledge" that should be characteristic of professional programs irrespective of setting?; (b.) How and where can more field experience be provided at the various levels of training?; (c.) How can we define the major junction points on a function-by-level career lattice in industrial-organizational psychology?; (d.) How can effective programs of continuing education be encouraged in various topics and locations?

3. Most recommendations are implicitly related to the clinical-counseling-mental health interests of the majority of the participants. The executive committee should urge the

"follow-up commission" to sort out the recommendations that apply to concepts of mental health and those that are applications of other fields of psychology.

4. Program evaluation is a major and compelling problem addressed by the Conference. Both the Professional Affairs and Scientific Affairs committees should consider (independently, I should think) how the impact of training might be evaluated after one begins his professional career.

As a start here, I recommend that the Executive Committee affirm the scientific heritage of the members of this division and denounce the use of professional practices adopted without consideration for scientific knowledge.

The term "without consideration for" is deliberate. Existing knowledge may be disregarded as inadequate, irrelevant, or wrong for a given setting, but it should be considered. What is to be condemned, and now, is bandwagon-jumping—the adoption and following of a faddish technique or a "theory" with no better reason than its momentary popularity.

5. A specific contributor to the ninth category of recommendation in my summary above is this: "That APA assume responsibility for exploring and developing career markets for services employing individuals trained in psychology."

I recommend that, independently of any APA action (which is bound to be oriented toward mental health), Division 14 appoint a Task Force to secure funds for and to carry out this recommendation.

**APA Annual Meeting  
August 30 -  
September 3  
NEW ORLEANS**



THE W.E. UPJOHN INSTITUTE FOR EMPLOYMENT RESEARCH  
offers

### A SYSTEMS APPROACH TO TASK ANALYSIS AND JOB DESIGN

A 4½ DAY TRAINING SEMINAR-WORKSHOP FOR  
PERSONNEL OFFICERS  
WAGE AND SALARY SPECIALISTS  
INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS PERSONNEL  
PROGRAM STAFF

engaged in  
\*JOB DEVELOPMENT \*UPGRADING  
\*JOB RESTRUCTURING \*JOB TRAINING  
\*CAREER DESIGN \*AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

#### WHAT DOES THE COURSE DO?

- Provides a way of seeing manpower problems in a systems context.
- Develops skill and local capability in Task Analysis.
- Relates Task Analysis to local manpower planning and utilization problems.
- Provides experience in using a Task Bank as a resource.

#### WORKSHOP ENROLLMENT:

- DATES: Mar. 11-15; June 10-14; Sept. 30-Oct. 4; Dec. 3-6, 1974.
- LOCATION: The Madison Hotel, Washington, D.C.\*\*
- WORKSHOP FEE: \$250 per participant. Includes tuition and workshop materials. Travel and living expenses not included.

\*\*ARRANGEMENTS CAN ALSO BE MADE TO GIVE THE WORKSHOP TO SPECIFIC ORGANIZATIONS ON LOCATION.

#### TRAINING MATERIALS:

- The entire curriculum is also available as a multi-media package for use in in-house training programs.
- Preview package of training materials is available for \$5.00, prepaid.

#### FOR DETAILED INFORMATION ON SEMINAR-WORKSHOP AND TRAINING PACKAGE

CONTACT: Sidney A. Pine, W.E. Upjohn Institute for Employment Research,  
1101 - 17th St., N.W. Suite 305, Washington, D.C. 20036.  
PHONE: (202) 223-4747.